

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XXIII.]

NOVEMBER.

[Vol. II.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

SECOND LETTER FROM THE REV. FRANCIS STONE, ON HIS
LATE VISITATION SERMON.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I CANNOT resist the temptation to treat as well my Trinitarian, as my Unitarian Christian brethren, preachers, both within and without the pale of the Church, with a copy of a resolution passed by the committee for auditing the accounts of the Clergy's Fund, at Baddow, Essex, in June; and of another by the Southern Unitarian Society, at their annual meeting at Horsham, Sussex, in July. The two resolutions exhibit a striking contrast.—“Resolved, that the offer of 5*l.* by Francis Stone, Rector of Cold Norton, towards the support of the Fund for the benefit of the widows and orphans of the Essex Clergy, as being the profits of two editions of his *blasphemous and heretical* Visitation Sermon, be rejected with *disdain*.” (N.B. I cannot be quite exact in copying every word, as I have left the original with a particular friend). “Resolved, that the thanks of this Society be given to the Rev. Francis Stone, for the exertion he made in the cause of truth, by preaching and publishing the Sermon, which he delivered on the 8th day of July, 1806.” Now Mr. Editor, “*utrum horum mavis accipe.*” You see, like the apostles, I have my share of “evil report and good report.” I leave it to Unitarian Christians in general to determine, whether the former resolution be not highly seasoned with the cayenne of sacerdotal arrogance, insolence, ignorance and intolerance. With respect to the latter resolution, I cannot evince my gratitude to the society for their honourable testimony to my exertions in the cause of truth, more to their and my own satisfaction, than by a devout, cordial

prayer to God to prosper their active, well-tempered zeal to diffuse, after the example of Christ, and in conjunction with the London and other country societies of the kind, the knowledge of, and the sole exercise of worship due to the "one living and true God, the Father," through the whole human race, by the distribution of appropriate tracts on the subject. The Unitarian Fund Society is also worthy of all praise for setting apart a portion of it for the support of preachers among the dissenters on the Unitarian plan. I beg leave to suggest a hint that if the Fund should increase so as to admit providing the public watering-places, as well inland as maritime, with chapels and ministers for this great and good purpose during the season, they would form something of a counterpoize to the influence of Methodist preachers, with which these places abound, especially if the former be careful to deliver their discourses with force and energy, and with a suitable natural action and gesture, but free from their noise and rant.

I have the honour to be,

Mount-Sign, Your obliged Friend, and obedient Servant,
Tunbridge Wells, Oct. 3d. FRANCIS STONE.

AN EPISTLE OF GROTIUS, ON THE SILENCE OF THE EVANGELISTS, CONCERNING THE HISTORY OF CHRIST'S LIFE, PREVIOUSLY TO HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY.

To Peter Puteau.

SIR,

Paris.

IN answer to the question which a friend lately put to you, Why they who wrote the books which we call the gospels, relate none of the actions of our Lord, except what Luke mentions as happening in his twelfth year, till he was thirty years of age? the matter appears to me in this light:—The subject which an author is to handle, or which he is to pass over, is to be determined by the design of his work. The apostles and their disciples did not intend to write an indiscriminate history of Christ: but the great topic, which they published in their preaching, and which they committed to writing was, as the title, gospel, intimates, the new doctrine, that required sincere repentance and promised remission of sins and eternal life: which was preached in a way of preparation by the baptist, perfectly promulgated by Christ, and by the apostles, under an express command, carried into the whole world. Matt. iv. 23.

ix. 33. xxiv. 14. Mar. i. 14. Eph. vi. 15. Acts x. 36. Luke xvi. 16. Hence every doctrine disagreeing with the doctrine of Christ is called *another gospel*. 2 Cor. xi. 4. Gal. i. 6. But the death of Christ, his resurrection, ascension into heaven and the gifts of the holy spirit, by all which he was declared to be the Son of God, attested the truth of the doctrine and the certainty of the promise revealed by him. Hence the gospels consist of two parts, doctrine, and history confirming the doctrine. A witness of his resurrection, Peter says, must be ordained out of those who had conversed with Christ from the time that John began to baptize, till he himself was taken up into heaven. Acts i. 22. And he elsewhere, chap. x. 37, calls the principles which were published through Judea, beginning in Galilee, after the baptism which John preached, **THE WORD**. Luke describes his treatise as a narrative of those things which Jesus did and taught from the time he began to teach and work miracles, even till he was taken up. Acts i. 1, 2. The first miracle which he performed, was at Cana, in Galilee, John ii. 11. after he had been baptized by John; which happened in his thirtieth year. Luke iii. 23. In this instance it was the will of God, that the law, which did not admit the Levites to their sacred office before that age, should be observed by Christ. Num. iv. 3. 47. 1 Chron. xxiii. 3. The relations of his divine origin by the apostle John, of his human descent by Matthew and Luke, and of the pledges of his future character in the temple given by the last writer; are to be looked upon as prefaces, to point to and recommend the person, from whom each gospel would derive its authority. Therefore as nothing relative to his great office was done by Christ before that mature age, the former period is properly passed over in silence by the sacred writers; for he spent his life till then in privacy and in subjection to his supposed father and mother. Luke ii. 51. Hence he was not only called *τεκλιος υιος*, the Son of a carpenter. Matt. xiii. 55, but he is described as *τεκτων*, a carpenter. Mark vi. 3. Justin Martyr speaks of his making ploughs and yokes and other articles. In the books of the Old Testament, you will observe that often nothing is said of the prophets till the word of the Lord came unto them: that is till the time *αναδειξεως αυτων προς τον Ισραηλ*, till their showing unto Israel, as it is expressed by Luke. c. i. 80. This is the circumstance intimated in the phrase, "a prophet arose."

REMARKS.

The reasons assigned by Grotius, in the preceding passage, for the silence of the Evangelists, concerning the private period of Christ's

life, will appear, it is conceived, just and satisfactory. But they not only justify the sacred historians, but shew them to be considerate and judicious writers. A credibility is by these means derived to their narrative. It is formed to answer a precise and definite end, that is, to exhibit Jesus in his public character, and to give such specimens of his discourses and works, as were sufficient to illustrate the nature of his doctrine, and to evince the truth of his mission. It was not their intention to gratify a vain curiosity, to raise an useless astonishment in the minds of the reader, or to pour out lavish eulogiums on the subject of their history. Had they been governed by a disposition to exaggerate, forge and invent; would they have written in a strain so moderate and modest? Would they have kept themselves within the limits of the public ministry of their master, or confined themselves to those scenes, in the narrative of which, as being public, they were most open to detection, if they deviated from real facts? This is very different from the tenor of the Apocryphal gospels, very different from a fictitious tale, very different from the legends of popish saints, very different indeed, from those genuine histories, which are meant to give a full delineation of a character, and to set off, to all possible advantage, a distinguished and eminent personage. While my pen has been in my hand, I have met with a passage in the candid Lardner, so much to the purport of these remarks, that I am tempted to give it.

“How simple and plain, how free from all pomp and ostentation, is the beginning of every gospel. The writer enters immediately upon the matters of fact he has to relate, without any laboured introduction, without any attempt to raise the expectation, or engage the affections of the reader. If it had been an artificial story, invented and composed with design, we should have many other particulars in it than are now there. They have not sought out occasions to enhance their Master's honour. The former part of his life is almost entirely passed over, and, besides his miraculous birth, the obeisance paid him by the wise men, and some extraordinary circumstances at the purification of the virgin, scarce any notice of him from that time to his public appearance at about the age of thirty, excepting that one fact of his arguing with the doctors in the temple. Luke. ii. 46. Had it been a story forged and contrived, his infancy and youth had not been thus slightly passed over: we should have had many accounts of wonderful preservations, and a miraculous providence attending him all along, there would have been related divers omens and presages of the figure he was afterwards to make in the world; numerous specimens of pregnant capacity and zeal: whereas the historians have almost immediately entered upon his public appearance, which was, what mankind was chiefly concerned in.”

Lardner's Works, Vol. x. p. 552, 553.

B—m.

J. T.

SUPPLEMENT TO MR. KENRICK'S SERMONS ON THE STATE
OF THE DEAD.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

IF you think the following scriptural argument for the suspension of consciousness between death and the resurrection, worthy of a place in your Repository, you may insert it. It was drawn up as a supplement to the three sermons on the state of the dead, in the first volume of the excellent sermons of the late Rev. T. Kenrick.

LANDTERB.

1. If man enjoy continued consciousness through the intervening time between death and the resurrection, he must grow *better*, or *worse*, or *neither*.

2. That he should remain of exactly the same character, without the smallest alteration in the nature or degree of it, though he had the exercise of his mental faculties and affections during that interval, which his being in a state of consciousness would imply, is contrary to all our experience and observation in the present state, and inconceivable without supposing, that the Deity will employ a perpetual miracle to prevent any change of character.

3. That the Deity should make use of a constant miracle for such purpose, is contrary to all reasoning, from analogy and from the nature of man, and has no countenance whatsoever from the light of nature or of revelation.

4. If a man's character should undergo a change during his existence in an intermediate state, it will be different in some respect or other at the close of that period from what it was at the commencement.

5. If at the end of that period and when the day of judgment is arrived, his character be different from what it was at the time of his death, and the sentence he then receives be one that is suited and proportioned to the character, with which he quitted the present life, it will be adapted to a character, which in nature, degree, or both, no longer exists, and the righteous Judge of mankind will not treat him according to what he *then* is.

6. If on the other hand his sentence be adapted to his then present character, he will *not receive the things done in the body according to what he had done whether good or evil*, which is contrary to express declarations in the New Testament. See Rom. ii. 6. 2 Cor. v. 10. Gal. vi. 7. Eph. vi. 8, &c. &c.

7. From the preceding articles it follows, that, whether the sentence passed on man at the judgment, be adapted to the one or the

370 *Remarks on the Appellation of "Rational Dissenters."*

other of the two characters before mentioned, it will, in the one case, be irreconcilable with just ideas of the divine equity, or in the other, with repeated assurances contained in the christian code; unless the Almighty exercise a constant miracle during the whole time intervening between death and the resurrection, which that he will do we have no evidence whatsoever. The consequence, therefore, is, that the time between death and the resurrection will pass without any consciousness in the dead, and that as the tree falls, so it will lie, and as death leaves us, so judgment will find us.

REMARKS ON THE APPELLATION OF "RATIONAL
DISSENTERS."

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I AM sorry that I was not able sooner to discharge the promise, which I made in my last, of furnishing you with some further remarks on the Note taken from Dr. Magee's treatise on *Atonement and Sacrifice*; but I hope that this communication will not yet be deemed too late, or too devoid of interest, to be inserted, whenever you shall think proper. I refer for the Note, and the remarks on it, to No. xix. p. 358, of your Repository. My present remarks are confined to the charge brought against the Unitarians in the latter part of the Note: "From a feeling [modesty] similar to that which has given birth to this denomination [Unitarian] they demand also to be distinguished from the other nonconformists by the appellation of *Rational Dissenters*."

No false modesty. Mr. Editor, shall prevent me from acknowledging, that I (speaking for myself individually) do demand to be distinguished by the epithet of *Rational* not only from a large number of nonconformists, but also from the great body of orthodox Christians throughout the world, whether within or without the pale of any favoured establishment, and I am ready to make good my pretensions to this term as a distinguishing characteristic of the generality of Presbyterian Dissenters, or, as with equal propriety they are sometimes called, *Liberal Dissenters*.

But permit me first, Sir, in due form to advertise the readers of the profound doctor, that we are not so *very* modest in our demand to be deemed rational, as to pronounce other men or Christians *destitute of rational faculties*. This observation I am reluctantly constrained to make *totidem verbis*; because,

though the Doctor has not chosen to speak explicitly concerning the specific nature of the rationality which we modestly arrogate to ourselves, yet I cannot divest myself of all suspicion of there being some lurking insinuation under his ambiguous expression.

Dr. Magee, Sir, might have given *some* information concerning the assumption of this appellation by the Unitarians. He might have just said, that these men think that their form and modes of worship, and the articles of their creed, are more conformable to the dictates of REASON than those of other Christians; and likewise that they are great advocates for the *use of reason* in matters of religion, while their opponents openly derogate from its pretensions. If he had said this, he had been honest, and had spoken the truth without doing injury to his own cause. But I shall appeal from Dr. M.'s uncharitable opinions and unfair statement, *evidently* dictated by the characteristic prejudice and rancour of the generality of his order—*flagrat vitio gentisque suoque*—to the good sense of those who have not too much modesty to use their reason; and I shall convince them, I hope, by a comparison of our religious devotions, and our opinions concerning the use of reason, with those of other Christians, that our claim to the distinction of *rational* is not wholly a *modest insinuation*, but a very well-grounded pretension.

All the different denominations of Christians, from the lofty hierarchy to the most insignificant sect, are distinguished by something or other which sufficiently marks their contempt of *reason*, or that faculty by which alone we judge concerning truth and error in opinion, and right and wrong in conduct; against whom the liberal dissenters, especially the Unitarians, have, much to their credit, frequently protested. Most denominations, if not all, believe in some awful *mysteries*, which baffle the most vigorous efforts of reason. To believe what they do not understand, is a highly meritorious act of faith. Many of them pretend to hold immediate supernatural communications with the Deity, which are peculiar to the system of grace, and confined to the elect; nor are the same favoured race unsusceptible of suggestions of a different tendency, and from a very different quarter. The great mass of all these incoherent sects of believers, who yet deem themselves infallible, believe that moral qualities are, by some enigmatical masterpiece of divine policy, transferable from one person to another; but with this distinction, a person is *necessarily* wicked by another's vice, and he *may* become good by another's virtue. Some of

512 *Remarks on the Appellation of "Rational Dissenters."*

them lay a very great stress upon modes of dress and positions of the body in divine worship; they have a great veneration for particular times; and they contract a sacred reverence for certain places and persons, on whom, by uttering a prescribed charm, they confer qualities of a *moral denomination*, inasmuch as they continue *holy* ever after, even if it be against their inclination. Many think the performance of certain ceremonies to be of wonderful efficacy, to young and old, in order to obtain admittance into heaven. I know none of these embattled hosts, whose modesty, to say the least, is not equal to that of the Unitarians, and their humility to that of Dr. M. for some are christened the *Orthodox*, others *Evangelical Christians*, others *Vital Christians*, others the *Church*, &c. &c. And why should I not add, Mr. Editor, that with many the very life and soul of religion consists in a certain twang of voice, a certain affected brogue or slang, an oddness and quaintness of expression, a certain grimace of countenance and uncouthness of gesture, and an eternal affectation of canting piety?

To add to the list of things as irrational as disgusting were not difficult; but, without deigning to prove the irrationality and absurdity of the things above mentioned, permit me to say, that I am not ashamed of the modesty that arrogates to be distinguished from Christians of such a complexion in general, as well as from our brother nonconformists in particular, by the appellation of *Rational Dissenters*.

But, Sir, I can produce a still stronger claim, by virtue of which the Unitarians may justly claim to be distinguished from the Orthodox, by the epithet *Rational*. From their own mouth let them be judged. I will state in their own words the respective sentiments of the Orthodox and the Unitarians concerning reason.

The sentiments of the Orthodox concerning reason:

"If, on the contrary, our pride of understanding, and self-sufficiency of reason are not made to prostrate themselves before the awful, mysterious truths of revelation, we may bear the name of Christians, but we want the essence of christianity." Dr. Magee's Sermon on Atonement, p. 21.

The Doctor grievously accuses the Unitarians of "glorifying in having brought the high things of God to the level of man's understanding." Id. p. 13.

Hear what the great Orthodoxarch Calvin says: "In the knowledge of God and our salvation, and in framing a rule of life, the most wise are blinder than moles." Again: "The highest perfection [*acumen*] of human reason, as far as it re-

lates to the knowledge of God, is mere darkness." And he says that by the *carnal man* (1 Cor. ii. 1.) is meant such as rely upon natural reason. Calv. Instit. L. II. cap. ii. § 18—20.

Once more : permit me to quote a passage from the last number but one of your Repository, written by an orthodox son of the Church. "The point is not what the divine Being can be according to our pre-conceived notions of possibilities or probabilities, but what he is said *to be*, and *to do* in scripture :"—*i. e.* (if words retain their usual acceptation) whatever the bible—uncriticized, or not "Socinian-tortured," says, must be understood in the most literal and obvious sense of the words, without the presumption of consulting our reason and notions of things. Our pre-conceived notions, *i. e.* whatever notions may heretofore have appeared to us to have been the best grounded in truth and reason, must be blindly renounced if the bible contradict them. Therefore, whatever *previous notions* we may have entertained concerning the Supreme Divinity, we must believe that he REPENTED, that he SMELLED A SWEET SMELLING SAVOUR, that he was *wroth*, &c. &c. because the scripture says that he *did* and *was* so. But, says my opponent, this language is *figurative*,—this is—No, no, Sir; no *reason*, if you please, no *pre-conceived notions*, no "Socinian torture." Besides, Sir, you *must* believe the horrid doctrine of transubstantiation itself, because the scripture positively asserts it. No, say you, *Because*—Yes, you can *reason* when it suits your purpose.

In fact, Sir, (for to cite more witnesses were useless), it is well known, that it is a common practice with the orthodox to disparage reason as *blind* and *carnal*, and that they scarcely ever cease to vilify the best gift of the benevolent Creator, and the most distinguishing characteristic of man.

I shall now state the sentiments of the Unitarians concerning *reason*, but I shall give only a few instances, as our opponents have been ever disposed to give ample credit to our professions in this particular:

"As we cannot in *reason*, we are not obliged by *revelation*, to carry our *faith* one jot beyond our *understanding*."

Again:

"Where the *mystery* begins, religion ends." Foster's Sermons.

"Be not backward, or afraid, my brethren, to make use of your reason in matters of religion, or where the scriptures are concerned."

Again:

"Distrust all those, who decry human reason, and who re-

quire you to abandon it wherever religion is concerned. When once they have gained this point with you, they can lead you whither they please, and impose upon you every absurdity which it is expedient for them that you should embrace."

Priestley's Address to the Professors of Christianity. p. 2. 3.

"—— Believed the doctrine of the trinity without understanding it, which, in fact, is no belief at all." Priestley's Hist. of Early Opin. v. iii. p. 232.

See excellent remarks on this subject in Letters to Wilberforce, by A Layman. Let. 1. p. 28—37.

I believe, Sir, that it is a notion generally entertained by the Rational Dissenters, and I may add, by all consistent rational men, that no proposition can be possibly believed, except all the terms of it be understood; that propositions which assert things incompatible with one another, are not mysteries, but palpable contradictions and absurdities; and that *if* in the bible itself, such contradictions were to be found, the pretensions of *that* part to a divine origin, would, *ipso facto*, be unavailable—because there cannot, in the nature of things, be a stronger evidence for it, than there is against it, viz. its dissonance with the only principle in man which can reason and judge.

I ask *Cler. Dunelm*, or any other person, How is the volume of inspiration proved to be entitled to credit? If not by the sanction of *reason, human reason*, (for alas! we have no other), let them inform us by what other evidence. But if reason be the only criterion of its truth, are we not necessarily obliged to renounce the belief of its infallibility whenever it contradicts the dictates of that reason? except indeed our reason be of such a nature as to be capable of proving the same things to be at the same time both true and false. Admit to *Cler. Dunelm*, the inspiration of the scriptures, and set aside the rules of criticism, and he is ready to meet you; and equally so is the most ignorant enthusiast that disgraces christianity.

I now hope, Sir, that the observations I have made, have quite expelled the sarcasm of the Doctor's awkward irony; that the same analogy of language, which designates the worship of *one* God by the term Unitarian, will signify the worship of *three* Gods by the term Trinitarian; and that to the title of Rational Dissenters and Christians we have a just claim, and might, if pride were allowable, be proud of the distinction. As to our *modesty*, I am afraid we are deficient in that virtue for lack of good example. But I hope we shall never follow another example, exhibited on every side, an example of spleen, malignity, prejudice and unappeasable rancour, vented in every possible

mode against sects in general, and against us poor Unitarians in particular, by the priests of the establishment; and by this characteristic feature, (*facies omnibus una*) may Dr. M. be easily recognized as one of the holy fraternity. Whatever the demerits of sectarists may be, *their* disgrace will remain indelible as long as Christians shall love to cherish the benign influences of their benevolent religion, or as long as men shall possess prudence enough to discover and appreciate the motives of human actions.

I conclude, Sir, with apologizing for the length of this communication, which has insensibly grown to be, I am afraid, inordinate, and with observing that there is in Dr. M.'s long and multifarious notes much matter for remark and animadversion, to which, perhaps, at some future time, I may presume to solicit your readers' attention.

Oct. 14, 1807.

W. J.

SIR FRANCIS AND HENRY: CHARACTERS FROM REAL LIFE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

As I apprehend it to be a part of the plan of your useful and liberal Magazine to admit whatever may have a tendency to correct false views of human life, and to point out more plainly the path of human duty, I send you a sketch of two characters drawn in the way of parallel: the one a baronet of large possessions, the other, an unfortunate youth* who died in a poor house. I assure you the strictest regard has been paid to the truth of fact, which it is necessary to premise, as it is upon this circumstance principally that its usefulness depends. By inserting it entire, you will much oblige your constant reader,

York, October 28, 1807.

C. C.

In the same age, the same country, and at the same period, lived Sir Francis and Henry. They spoke the same language, and were considered as being both of the same religion—that is to say, had the question been asked—are Sir Francis and Henry Christians? are they members of the Church of England, as by law established? the answer respecting both would have been given in the affirmative. In their mental powers there seems also to have been this general resemblance, that both of them possessed what are usually called good natural parts: Sir Francis properly educated might have risen to eminence as a senator; and Henry, had his talents been cultivated, might

* This youth was the brother of a young woman, Charlotte Richardson, a small volume of whose Poems was lately published.

576 *Sir Francis and Henry: Characters from real Life.*

have improved the skill of the artist, or extended the discoveries of science. But here every shadow of resemblance completely vanishes, for in the goods of nature and of fortune, no two youths of the same species could differ more widely.

Sir Francis was the only son and sole representative of an ancient and honourable house—born to the possession of an ample fortune, and nursed in a magnificent mansion, where his wants and desires were constantly anticipated, by a numerous train of servile attendants: Henry, never knew his father—his unfortunate mother, herself an orphan, friendless and poor, and his habitation a lowly cottage. From his earliest infancy he was neglected and forlorn, a very outcast of society. In their exterior, the contrast, if possible, was still more striking. Sir Francis was distinguished for the gracefulness of his person, the politeness of his address, and a certain assuredness of manner, which seldom fails, especially if accompanied by rank and fortune, of obtaining universal suffrage. Henry, feeble in constitution, from early neglect and the want of proper nutriment, timid from discouragement, and oppressed by hard labour, grew up deformed, and at length in consequence of a hurt received in childhood, became a cripple. In respect of learning however, Henry had somewhat the advantage. Sir Francis having early lost his father became the idol of his remaining parent. She was proud, insolent and vain; valued herself on her beauty, her superficial accomplishments, and tinsel ornaments, and admired her son for his rank, his station, and his imposing exterior: she worshipped him herself, and required that his tutors should worship him also: unfortunately for him, they obeyed the injunction, and the consequence, it were not difficult to anticipate. To be a learner, implied inferiority; to gain knowledge, required attention and diligence; Sir Francis therefore did not learn: yet it is confidently affirmed, that after he grew up, he could make out an advertisement in a newspaper, or decypher the pedigree of a race-horse, and it is even said, that on his being appointed high-sheriff of a large and opulent county, he taught himself to write, so as to sign his own name. Henry on the contrary, as may well be imagined, had no regular tutors, but he was sent by his mother to a Sunday school, and being by nature intelligent, and by habit, industrious and obedient, he faithfully treasured up every scanty fragment of the moral and intellectual feast which he found there. He learnt the Lord's prayer and the ten commandments—he could repeat, if not fully understand, the church catechism; got by rote a few psalms, and proverbs of wisdom, and what was at least not less important, he learnt to read them himself in the bible that was given him by the hand of charity.

But who is that striking figure driving four in hand in a splendid phaeton, followed by a train of attendants, the gazing multitude, bowing as he passes? It is Sir Francis going to bet at a horse race. And who is that little, insignificant, diminutive object, who but for the kind care of a poor charity girl, had been thrown down and trampled to death

in the crowd ? It is Henry, sent by his master on business which admitted not of delay, and which to execute faithfully, and with the necessary dispatch, had nearly cost him his life. If the meed of honour were always the reward of merit, Henry, poor, despised, and neglected, young as he then was, would have risen high among human characters, whilst Sir Francis, followed, flattered, and admired, would have sunk to the very bottom of the scale. But the passing multitude had no eye to discern their moral or religious attainments; of these there was no visible criterion, and they would have passed wholly unnoticed, had they not been carefully marked down by the recording angel, whose vigilance never slumbers, and who keeps a faithful register of human actions. If however the comparative circumstances of their outward prosperity underwent no immediate change, in respect of inward composure and heart-felt peace of mind, the scale was every day preponderating in favour of Henry. Of an amiable temper, patient, meek and resigned, this child of sorrow had learnt in the school of adversity to feel for the sorrows of others, and in the tear of sympathy shed over their misfortunes, had found the amelioration of his own. In the sufferings and death of his divine master, he had learnt to look forward beyond the present scene, and to estimate its value and importance, not so much by the quantity of actual present enjoyment, as by the opportunities afforded of greater advancement in piety and virtue. Sir Francis on the contrary, accustomed, from early infancy, to the indulgence of every capricious desire, became from day to day more and more the slave of self will, and the dupe of every unhallowed and ungoverned passion; incapable of thought or of a moment's reflection, he spent the passing hours amidst a numerous train of four-legged domestics, a fierce blood-hound being his bosom friend; or, among a low circle of biped associates, hardly more rational, and far less innocent than they; for *those* adhered faithfully to the principles of their nature, whilst *these* had dishonoured and corrupted their's. After a time however, even his outward prosperity began to decline, and with it, the deceitful respect so long paid him by others. His property was consumed in thoughtless extravagance, or in shameless vice; or suffered to run idly to waste for want of attention. His fine domain wore the face of universal desolation. The magnificent apartments of his superb mansion, were hidden from the face of day, himself inhabiting the steward's room in the rustic story. The doors of the lofty hall leading to an elegant saloon, were fast closed more than twenty years, for Sir Francis loved not the light; it suited not with the unhallowed orgies in which his soul delighted. At length, his excellent constitution, vigorous and strong, and built for one hundred years in duration, began to give way, before it had reached a fourth part of that period. The health of Henry also declined: the little spark of life which had hitherto animated his feeble frame, burnt still more dimly, and without a friend or relative, save one orphan sister, by whom he was tenderly beloved, being unable to labour any longer,

he devolved upon the parish for support, and was removed to the common poor-house. Sir Francis, become now the decided victim of disease, brought on by intemperate excess, without a real friend, save the savage animal who constantly shared his apartment and his couch, without mental or moral resource, and unable to endure the languid days and wearisome nights of exhausted nature, drank deeper and still deeper of the intoxicating draught, which, whilst it afforded a temporary relief, perpetually increased the disease that was preying upon his vitals. Now and then a ray of intellect would dart across his beclouded mind, but it served only to render visible the moral deformity that reigned there; it was dismissed therefore the moment it was perceived, for the pangs of remorse were not to be endured—and hereafter, if such there were, what horror in the bare supposition! what if an inquiry should be instituted respecting talents not merely neglected, but abused, not alone perverted, but applied to purposes the most mischievous? A physician was consulted, who honestly announced the impending catastrophe; Sir Francis was alarmed, but not reformed; he affected to deride the friendly warning and applied for relief to a double dose of his favourite beverage, till at length, repeated attacks of apoplexy, in his 30th year, fully verified the awful prediction. Ah! that his memory could be blotted for ever from the book of human remembrance! Pity would have granted the boon, but it was peremptorily denied by yonder miserable groupe of ruined females, whose innocence he has destroyed, whose character he has blasted, and whose vices, spreading their baneful influence, wider and still wider among the various ranks of society, will transmit his name, and perpetuate his infamy, to remote generations.

Henry in the mean time, supported in his humble asylum, exhibited the most edifying example to all around him. His disease, although brought on apparently by the agency of misfortune, he considered as the deed of providence, for without God, he well knew, that nothing comes to pass; he felt it therefore, as the chastisement for his good, of a tender father. The master and mistress of the poor-house, interested by his virtues, affected by his sufferings, and edified by his piety, loved him as their son, and treated him with the utmost kindness. He had a natural taste for drawing, and whilst confined to his lowly bed, would sometimes beguile the heavy hours by sketching little groups of variously diversified figures, not wholly devoid of taste and elegance. These he gave away as they were finished to his companions in the poor-house, and to their rude uncultivated mind they appeared as an astonishing effort of genius. They respected him therefore, at first, for his talents, and being not wholly unimpressed by the sweetness of his temper, and the sanctity of his whole deportment, he gained by degrees a considerable influence over them. Sometimes he would read to a wretched group assembled around him of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah for the wickedness of their inhabitants; of the faith of Abraham, his great devotedness to the will of

God, and its reward; of the fidelity to his master, of the ancient servant of Isaac; of the many virtues which distinguished the character of Joseph; of the wonderful preservation of Moses the servant of God, and of the awful judgments inflicted in Egypt, on Pharaoh and his host, for their obstinacy and disobedience to the commands of God. Often would he dwell with delight on the courage and inflexible integrity of Daniel, which forsook him not in the lions' den. The beautiful strains of exalted devotion of David, the shepherd king, would delight and elevate his soul; and when he read the parables of the prodigal son, of the good Samaritan, the affecting history of Lazarus rising from the tomb, his heart would expand with the widest charity to every human being. My divine Master, he would say, felt for the miseries and sorrows of all, why may not these my wretched associates, be converted, and become joint partakers with me in the glorious hopes of the gospel? In his sister, then a servant, but formerly brought up in a charity school, he enjoyed the pure and entire affection of a kindred and pious mind. Often did their thoughts ascend to heaven, and in joint and fervid orisons, prefer the devout and humble prayer that these sufferings, which were but for a moment, might work out for the patient endurer a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! The prayer was heard; for some months indeed Henry still lingered, but at length, not alone with calm composure, but with assured hope and humble triumph, resigned his life to him who gave it, in the 23d year of his age.

We will not drop the tear of sorrow on the grave of the virtuous Henry, for of his award in the future and everlasting world, there can be no question. But with what sentiments of compassion, must we not contemplate the tomb of Sir Francis? His biographer is not his judge, but so far at least must be admitted, that for heavenly happiness, for every thing that is great, or good, or excellent, Sir Francis, the unhappy Sir Francis, is wholly unqualified.

DR. CHANDLER'S UNPUBLISHED WORKS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I CORDIALLY join with your correspondent T. p. 482, in wishing that some "plan could be devised for the publication of the critical Notes on Scripture, by the late celebrated Dr. Chandler." I also should equally rejoice if this useful plan could be extended so as to include the 4 vol. of Miscellaneous Tracts, which the editor of the Doctor's sermons informs us were then prepared for the press by the worthy author, and only waited till a sufficient subscription was raised to defray the expense of publication.

Is it not a disgrace to the Dissenters that a minister who did them so much honour, and who, as T. justly remarks, "gave so many valuable specimens of his eminent learning," should have his useful and pious labours overlooked, and indeed consigned to oblivion, merely on account of the want of a trifling subscription to defray the expense of introducing them to the world? The opulent among the modern Dissenters are chiefly engaged in commercial avocations, and as such, may have no great relish for literary knowledge or pursuits; but for the honour of the religious denomination to which they are pleased to attach themselves, and for the accommodation of their brethren in humbler stations, they should encourage and patronize the useful labours of their more eminent ministers, more especially as they would find upon trial, that the sums wanted for these most laudable purposes would amount to a mere pittance, when compared to those heavy expenses to which many of them now willingly subject themselves by conforming to the frivolous and unmanly fashions of the age.

Your's,
A FRIEND TO MERIT.

P.S. Dr. Chandler is said to be the writer of more than fifty papers in that valuable periodical work, the *Old Whig*. Can any of your correspondents ascertain which were the Doctor's?

A THEOLOGICAL CONVERSATION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

IT gives me great pleasure to hear of the increasing circulation of your very useful Magazine, as it is a very excellent medium for the diffusion of Unitarian sentiments, and affords an opportunity to many of our persuasion, to inform our neighbours of the rising progress of that important truth, from which unhappily the great body of Christians has so long run astray. No effort should, I think, be left untried, to bring back our wandering brethren from the maze of error, in which their teachers endeavour to keep them entangled, and if we can convince the teachers themselves, so much the better is it for the cause, that must, whether the present generation chooses or not, ultimately succeed. A circumstance that occurred to me the other day, led me to apprehend, that the difficulties are not so great, as we

sometimes are apt to imagine. I overtook on the road a person with a bible in his hand, taking his walk in the morning from a small country town. I took him to be a mechanic of the place; and, in passing him, congratulated his early application to study, and expressed my satisfaction, that his time was so well employed. This led to a conversation, in which I learned that he was not a mechanic but a man of study, acquainted with the bible in its original languages, and minister of the methodist congregation in the town, in Lady Huntingdon's connexion.

We chatted together on the importance of religious meditation, and the great duty imposed on every Christian, to form a true conception of his relation to God, through our Saviour; and I observed, how much indebted I was to the study of my Hebrew bible, by which I was at first led to understand clearly, what God had chosen to reveal of himself, and how to worship the God of Jesus Christ, who in earlier times was known by the names of Jehovah and the God of Israel. You do not then, he said, worship the plurality. No, Sir, I replied, God has said, "thou shalt worship no other gods but me:" if he had said to me, thou shalt worship the plurality, I should worship the plurality, I should undoubtedly worship it, but I cannot admit of any term in religious matters, which is unscriptural, and is the invention of human reason. He wished then to convince me, that a term might be used, which was not in the scripture; talked of essence and trinity; but I kept to the same point, that, as they were the invention of men, a true Christian could have nothing to do with them; he had a master, namely, Jesus, the Christ; he was ordered by that master, to have no other master; and all persons who set up for masters, and all persons who believe in these masters, were fallen from the truth, as it is in Jesus.

After a little discussion on these points, he asked me, whether I thought Jesus to be a man merely, like myself. I replied, yes in every respect, except, that he was more highly favoured by God, was the appointed saviour of mankind, and for his obedience, was raised to be the head of all mankind. Upon this my companion ran into the usual strain of gentlemen of this persuasion, assured me, that I could not be saved by this faith, and was necessarily doomed to perdition. To this I calmly replied, that such language was not very polite, and the mode of arguing was not good, for I might just as well say the same of himself; but I was taught not to judge any man; to his own Maker I leave him, and I did not doubt, that the Judge of all the earth would do right.

This language seemed to make some impression, and he undertook to convince me of my error, by running over a great quantity of texts of scripture, which, I observed, was a thing very easily done, and however it might take with a congregation, could not weigh at all with real lovers of truth. We went then more deliberately to the work, taking one at a time: he beginning with the first, namely; There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. You know Sir, he said, that these are the words of scripture. Indeed Sir, I do not. Not know it! you surprise me; it is a verse in St. John's third epistle. I know, I replied, that such a verse is said to be in John's third epistle, but I do not believe that John ever wrote it. Then, said he, you might as well say that John did not write the other verses, and we shall, by going on this way, have no scriptures at all. Not so, I replied, because you have a bad guinea, it does not follow that there are no good guineas; but, if there are bad guineas abroad, you will take care to know the good from the bad. St. John, I repeat it, never wrote that verse. But how came it in the bible then? he said. Many learned men believe John to have written that verse, and I never saw a Testament, whether Greek or English, without that verse in it. That may be, I replied, but I have seen many Testaments without it, and I have a Greek Testament myself, in which it is not. In the British Museum is a famous manuscript without it, and in fact there is not one Greek manuscript which has it, unless the manuscript was written lately. The newspapers also inform us of a strong fact, to corroborate the truth of what I assert. Mr. Buchanan, a Trinitarian clergyman, has lately visited the Hindoo Christians, on the coast of Malabar, who have manuscripts of the New Testament in the Syriac language of a very old date, and in none of these manuscripts is this pretended verse to be found. He did not know how this might be, said my companion, but he could not believe, that the men who translated the bible into English, would have suffered it to be in, unless they were certain, that it ought to be printed, for they were men of great learning, and we had no one of greater learning in these times. I did not assent to the latter proposition, and was asked, what man alive had so much learning? I replied, Professor Porson, the Greek professor of Cambridge, has more learning than all the translators put together. He has investigated the authority of this verse, he declares it to be spurious. So did Sir Isaac Newton. So did Mr. Emlyn. Griesbach has struck it out of

his Testament: the present bishop of Lincoln declares it to be spurious, and I could mention many others of the same opinion.

My companion was not inclined to acquiesce in any of these authorities, and observed, that, if the verse ought not to be there, the opinion contained in it was maintained in other parts of scripture, and was upheld by all the fathers of the Church. To this I replied, that the Greek fathers certainly did believe in the trinity, though they did not quote this verse to support it, which was an additional proof, that they had it not in their Testaments: and I added, that, if he was not satisfied in his mind, that the verse was originally written by John, he ought never to quote it; and I did not see, how he could do his duty to God, and to his congregation, if he used words as scripture, which were not in scripture. It became him to examine the arguments on both sides, and to judge impartially upon a fair view of the subject.

My companion, I observed, was a little struck with what I said, for he had kept company with men only of his own persuasion, and had never been accustomed to have any of his notions called in question. He had been taught a certain routine of opinions in his college, just as most dissenting ministers, particularly those of the Calvinistic persuasion, who do not study the bible to learn what God teaches, but to confirm by texts of scripture, from all quarters, what has been laid down by preceding teachers. This is a lamentable thing for the Christian world. The people are kept in ignorance, nearly as bad as that of popery, and the false arguments repeatedly used by their preachers, they do not dare to call in question, for fear of being stigmatised as heretics. My companion brought me, among others, that text, in which Jesus himself is by these teachers accused of that blasphemy, which, if he had uttered it would have deservedly brought him either to the fatal tree, or given sufficient grounds for confining him in a madhouse. "Before Abraham was, I am," said Jesus; that is, said my companion, Jesus says, that he is God. How is that, I replied? Why, said he, the term "I am," is the Hebrew name for God. If it is, I replied, then Jesus said only, "before Abraham was God;" and this was so well-known a truth, that it required no prophet from heaven to tell us it: but I added, you know very well, that the Hebrew language has no terms to express the words "I am," for in that language there is no present tense.

The coach coming up that was to take me on my journey, I was obliged to leave my companion, with whom I left matter to

ruminate upon, and it struck me afterwards, that, if you would give a place to this letter in your magazine, it might excite some of our Unitarian missionaries, to converse, wherever they have an opportunity, with the methodist teachers, and, hearing calmly all their denunciations, to set before them gradually those points, which may lead them to investigate the true meaning of the scriptures. The methodist has zeal, which only requires proper direction, and many methodist teachers have been eminently useful in bringing men from their false notions of religion, and to worship the only true God, the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

I remain, Sir,
Your sincere well-wisher,
VIATOR.

MR. STURCH ON MR. BENNETT'S SERMON.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

THE rule which you have adopted and announced to your correspondents at the end of your last number but one, "to insert nothing relating to matters of fact, which comes under the unauthentic shape of an anonymous letter," is so evidently right, and so highly important, that I will venture to say it must give pleasure to every one of your readers, and though I might otherwise feel some reluctance to publish my name, yet, as I mean to speak to *matter of fact* as well as matter of opinion, I shall conform to it without hesitation.

I have read the letter of your correspondent B. Marten, in your last number, with no little regret, because it contains evidence, that there is one individual, if not more, amongst a class of Christians, which I have always respected, who though professedly "a friend to free inquiry," is so much under the influence of system, as to be capable of misrepresenting facts in order to fix a stigma upon a worthy man who happens to differ from him. This, I confess, is a serious charge; but, I am sorry to say, not difficult to make out.

Mr. Bennett, in the Address to the Ministers and Representatives of the General Baptist Churches, prefixed to his discourse, expresses his thanks for the *patient attention* with which most of them heard him. But, says your correspondent, "I believe that in this he is very *incorrect*." What Mr. Marten would

here insinuate, it is not easy to say. I was present, as well as he, at the delivery of the sermon, and can bear witness that they *did* hear him from beginning to end, without interruption, without murmur, without any sign of disgust or impatience, and that after the close of the service, having occasion to converse with many friends whom I had not lately seen, several of them spoke of the discourse with great approbation. Not being a member of the assembly, I can give no account of what passed at the meeting for business which followed; but having been present at the dinner—not as professing an attachment to any sect or party, but as a friend of religion and religious men—I think it my duty to say, that the sermon was mentioned in my hearing with applause by many, and with dislike by none; and that, to my certain knowledge, the author is perfectly correct in saying, that it is “sent into the world at the request of several who heard it.” So little foundation is there for the broad assertion of Mr. M. that it “gave general dissatisfaction.”

If, however, the conduct of the worthy preacher had been such as it is represented to be by Mr. M. it was not merely calculated to give dissatisfaction, but called loudly for a vote of censure from the venerable assembly to whom it was addressed, for he would have us believe, that it was a “*violation of the universally prescribed privileges of female modesty and reserve!*” And this charge he endeavours to support by citing several expressions from the sermon, twelve in number, of which *seven are literal quotations from the New Testament*, and then appealing “to the good sense of any person, whether the discussion of such a subject was not *highly indecorous and improper.*”

After these heavy accusations against Mr. Bennett it must have excited a smile in the countenances of your readers to find Mr. M. declaring that he has taken up his pen “*merely* to exculpate the General Baptist Assembly from the odium so improperly cast upon them;” and it will naturally be asked, who is the *real calumniator* of the assembly, Mr. M. who denies that they had the candour to hear with patient attention, a gentleman whom they had invited to preach to them, or your Reviewer, who is “unwilling to believe” that they should be less ready than an assembly of the clergy, to manifest their regard to the right of private judgment.

Whether Mr. M. will acknowledge any portion of good sense in a man whose notions of modesty are somewhat different from his own, I cannot tell. For my own part, though I think I

feel as profound respect for the "delicate feelings of the other sex," as he, or any other person can entertain, so far as they are founded in nature, and connected with virtue; yet I think there may be false delicacy in either sex; and I have no hesitation in saying, that with that measure of understanding which nature has bestowed upon me, and with the utmost attention which I am capable of commanding, in the contemplation of this subject, I am unable to perceive the least indecency or impropriety in attempting to inquire, whether the carpenter of Judea, who was commissioned by the One God and Father of all, to shew men the way of salvation, and who "left them an example that they might follow his steps," was indeed, according to the scriptures, one "of the posterity of David," or whether he was, according to the orthodox faith, the creator of the world in human shape. If there was any indecorum in the proceedings of that day, it was not in Mr. Bennett's exercising his unquestionable right of choosing his own subject, according to immemorial usage upon these occasions, but it consisted in the angry attack which, I am sorry to hear, was made by one or two individuals, at the meeting for business, upon an humble, modest, conscientious minister of Christ, for endeavouring to enlighten the minds of his brethren, and to remove a part of that pagan rubbish by which the Christian Church has been so long disfigured and obscured.

The twelve short passages cited by Mr. M. as having given so much offence, he represents as having been *repeated thirty or forty times* in the space of half an hour. This statement upon the very face of it, is *incredible*; and whoever will take the pains to peruse the sermon as carefully as I have done, will find, that nothing can be more distant from the truth; only one of these phrases being used more than four times, and the far greater part of them only once.

The majority of these passages, as I have already said, are taken verbatim from that part of holy scripture which is generally considered as most interesting to Christians; and as I hope they need no defence in themselves, so I think the only apology that can be necessary for the preacher's use of them is, that they were the most pertinent to his argument that could be selected, and are indeed so harmless, that many chapters in that book, which are daily read, both in public assemblies and in private families, might much more plausibly be charged with indecency.

The passages which are Mr. B.'s own, are still more unexceptionable. Surely, Sir, no human being except your ingeni-

ous correspondent, would ever have thought it an offence to female modesty to say, that "the husband of the mother is the father of the son;" and my concern for the interest of common sense inclines me to hope, that there are very few besides him, who can perceive any indecorum in supposing, that "Isaiah never intended to say, that an unmarried woman should conceive a son." But really, Mr. Editor, if this squeamish humour be indulged, there is no saying to what extravagance it may be carried. Should it make farther progress, it may become necessary to have a new edition of the scriptures, in which all words and phrases, which such critics as our delicate friend Mr. Marten may deem improper for the female ear must be omitted; and at no great distance of time perhaps, even in common discourse, the term childbirth may be universally proscribed as "*highly indecorous*," the word marriage may be interdicted as "*violating the privileges of female modesty*," and even the simple appellations father and mother, may be discarded, as suggesting ideas offensive to "*delicate feelings*," and unfit to be tolerated in good company.

But I am afraid to go on, Mr. Editor, lest I should get into a strain of merriment unsuitable to the gravity of the subject. I therefore conclude with my hearty wishes for the removal of every impediment to the diffusion of Christian knowledge, and the enjoyment of Christian liberty; to which happy issue, the increasing circulation of your truly valuable and impartial miscellany, will, I trust, eminently contribute.

I am, Sir,

Your sincere friend, and constant reader

London, Nov. 5, 1807.

W. STURCH.

MR. BELSHAM'S STRICTURES UPON MR. B. CARPENTER'S
DEFENCE OF ARIANISM IN HIS LECTURES.

LETTER IX.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

IT will be allowed by all candid persons who are competent to form a judgment in the case, that in our inquiries into the true meaning of the sacred writers, we cannot be too much upon our guard against imposing upon ourselves by what we call *natural* interpretations: for as words have no natural connexion with ideas, what we intend by the natural meaning of words is commonly nothing more than the sense which we,

and the party to which we belong have been accustomed to associate with them, and may be as remote from the true meaning of the speaker, or the writer, as the East is from the West. While, on the contrary, the interpretation which we reject as far-fetched and unnatural, may in fact, be the real meaning of the author. "The common phraseology of St. Paul's epistles," says Mr. Locke, in his admirable preface, "every one uses familiarly, and thinks he understands, but it must be observed, that if he has a distinct meaning, when he uses those words, and phrases, and knows himself what he intends by them, it is always according to the sense of his own system. So that all this knowledge and understanding which he has in the use of these passages of sacred scripture reaches no further than this, that he knows, (and that is very well), what he himself says, but thereby knows nothing of what St. Paul said in them. The apostle wrote not by that man's system, and so his meaning cannot be known by it." In order therefore to ascertain the true meaning of the apostle's language, we are to consider not merely the sense in which we, and our party have been accustomed to understand it, but the sense which properly belongs to it, according to the established rules of just and legitimate criticism.

My friend concedes without hesitation, p. 172, that, "the pre-existence of Christ is not mentioned by the apostle Paul amongst the first principles and primary articles of the Christian faith, but is commonly mentioned by him incidentally, as a motive to the exercise of some Christian virtue." Surely these evangelists and apostles must have been men of a very singular kind, and very different from men of the present generation, since they could live and converse for months and even years, freely and familiarly, with a personage whom they knew to be the Maker and Governor of the world, without discovering any symptoms of awe or surprise, and in writing the history of his life and doctrine could either omit that stupendous fact altogether, as unworthy of serious notice, or if they mentioned it at all, could mention it merely incidentally, as amongst other topics, a motive to virtue. And this omission of the evangelists is the more inexcusable, as my worthy friend denies, p. 174, that "a mere man inspired by God, and enabled to work miracles would answer all the purposes of an angelic or super-angelic being. For men are influenced, greatly influenced by the messenger and by the ambassador who is sent to them. It is when we consider Christ as sent from heaven, as more nearly related to God, and dearer to him than any other being, that

we enter into the force of that declaration of him, "for God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son." How inexcusable then were the evangelists in withholding from their readers a doctrine of such high importance! And how can my friend reconcile it to his feelings, and to his principles to place such a doctrine in his catalogue of secondary truths.

1. The first passage which my friend cites from the writings of Paul in favour of the Arian hypothesis concerning the person of Christ, is, 2. Cor. viii. 9. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

Upon this my friend remarks, p. 168, "Surely his being rich must refer to a former state of glory, and his being poor to his abasement when he came into our world." To this argument it would perhaps be sufficient to reply—Surely not. If indeed it were admitted that the public version gives a correct translation of the apostle's words, which it does not, and if it could be proved from other premises that Jesus existed before he was born into this world, which it cannot, this text might be supposed to contain a remote and figurative allusion to that extraordinary fact. But that a person of my friend's understanding, could think of producing such a passage as this, as containing in itself decisive evidence of the pre-existence of Christ in a state of glory, is one instance amongst many of the great power of early prepossessions to warp the judgment even of candid and upright minds.

If however he will take the trouble of referring to the original, he will instantly see that the words of the apostle express two states, not successive, but simultaneous, not that Christ was first rich, and afterwards became poor, but that his riches were contemporary with his poverty. Πλουσιος ων, ἐπ'ωχρευσε, literally, "being rich he led a life of poverty." A fact this of frequent occurrence. The rich miser from avarice denies himself common necessities: and in some rare instances generous opulence will forego the comforts and elegancies of life to gratify more extensively the feelings of an enlarged and disinterested benevolence. Thus, being rich, they are at the same time poor. In strict analogy to these instances, our Lord, who possessed voluntary miraculous powers, by which he could have supplied himself with the greatest ease with all the conveniences and luxuries of life, chose to lead a life of indigence, of self-denial and dependence, in order to fulfil the purposes of his mission. Thus, being rich for our sakes, he lived in poverty, and herein

he exhibited a persuasive example to the rich to deny themselves for the benefit of the poor, which was very properly held up by the apostle to the Corinthians, as a motive to liberality, "That ye, through his poverty might be rich, rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." See 1 Tim. vi. 18.

ii. Eph. iii. 9, "God who created all things *by Jesus Christ.*"

For my friend's information upon this subject, I will tell him that the words, "*by Jesus Christ,*" are wanting in the Alexandrian, Vatican, Ephrem, Clermont, and other manuscripts of high repute: that they are not to be found in the Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Vulgate and old Italic versions, and that they are omitted in the citations of Basil, Cyril, Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and other ecclesiastical writers, that they are left out of the text by Griesbach in his second edition, and though retained by archbishop Newcome, they are marked by him as of doubtful authenticity. They are unquestionably spurious, they have no connexion with the context, and were probably a marginal gloss introduced into the text by some ignorant or officious scribe.

If however the words were genuine, they would prove nothing. My friend indeed alleges, p. 168, "the advocates for the simple humanity of Christ say, that when the works of creation are ascribed to him, it means only the dispensations of things under the gospel." We do: but to shew that we are not singular in this interpretation of the text before us, I will transcribe archbishop Newcome's note upon it. This learned primate was not a Unitarian, nevertheless, he remarks, "the sense most suitable to the place is this, Who hath created all things, that is both Jews and Gentiles, anew to holiness of life."

"But," continues my friend, "many of the expressions made use of in scripture, are too general and too extensive to be thus limited. It is said that all things were made by him," &c. The learned prelate however, who was an eminent scripture-critic, in the note which I have just cited, interprets the expression, "all things," as meaning nothing more than Jews and Gentiles. A very remarkable and important concession. In fact, these universal terms are often used by the sacred writers in a very limited sense. "All things," says the apostle Paul, "are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." "Ye have an unction from the holy one," says St. John, "and ye know all things." 1 John ii. 20.

iii. Heb. i. 2, "by whom also he made the worlds."

My friend's remark upon this passage, is, (p. 169,) "if we render it ages, and if by ages we understand dispensations, even that is too extensive for the single dispensation of the gospel." But the true interpretation of this text is probably that which was proposed by Grotius, and adopted by Dr. Lardner, Mr. Lindsey and others, viz. *with a view to whom* he constituted the ages, or dispensations, meaning that all former dispensations were intended to be introductory to the great and final dispensation of the Messiah. It is true that the preposition *διὰ*, when used with a genitive case commonly expresses the instrumental cause, but it sometimes, though rarely, expresses the final cause: of which some instances are to be found in Stockius and Schleusner.

iv. Col. i. 15, 16: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature, for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

My worthy friend leaves this text to speak for itself, without a comment. And our Arian brethren in general, regard it as a most palpable and unanswerable argument in favour of their hypothesis. It is indeed amusing to read the triumphant language which they hold upon this subject. "Nothing," says Dr. Clarke, "can be more forced or unnatural than the Socinian interpretation of this passage, who understand it figuratively of the new creation by the gospel." "The interpretation," says Mr. Pierce, "which refers what is here said of our Saviour to the new creation, is so forced and violent, that it can hardly be thought that men would ever have espoused it, but for the sake of a hypothesis." "To interpret this," says Dr. Doddridge, "as the Socinians do, of a new creation, is so unnatural, that one would hardly believe if the evidence were not so undeniably strong, that any set of learned commentators could fall into it." Last, but not least, comes the learned Dr. Harwood. "Words," says he, "I think have no meaning, and are not the true signs of ideas, if these plain and clear passages do not contain and manifest this position, that Jesus Christ was the person, who by the direction of the Deity, originally formed all things."

Such are the opinions expressed by these eminent critics and theologians. But with all due deference to their learning and talents, I must beg leave to insist, that by the epithets *natural*,

unnatural, and the like, in this connexion, they could mean nothing more than usual or unusual, such ideas as they had or had not been accustomed to annex to the terms in question, and that to persons who had been early habituated to understand this, and other similar passages of scripture, in the rational and consistent sense of the Polish reformers, the interpretation imposed upon the apostle's language by learned Arians, would appear as forced, as unnatural, and as violent, as the Unitarian interpretation appears to them. I am even perfectly convinced that nothing but a strong and riveted, though no doubt involuntary and unperceived, attachment to a favourite hypothesis, would have induced men of distinguished ability, learning and integrity, to have embraced an interpretation so remote from the apostle's meaning, and so little countenanced by his expressions. Had the apostle intended to assert that Jesus Christ was the Creator of the natural world, and all things in it, he would surely, have used the plain, intelligible language, which the sacred writers invariably adopt upon this subject; he would have announced him as the maker of the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all things which are therein. Whereas, on the contrary, instead of saying that heaven and earth were made by him, he only says that all things in the heavens and in the earth, were created by him: and descending to particulars, instead of specifying celestial luminaries, and terrestrial substances, he only specifies states of things, and mere civil distinctions, such as thrones, and dominions, and principalities, and powers. What then can be more evident than that the creation of which the apostle speaks is not the formation of natural substances, but the renovation of the rational and moral world. Of one or other of these subjects it is universally allowed that the apostle is discoursing: but it is certain that he is not speaking of the former, he must therefore intend the latter.

It is curious to observe how Dr. Doddridge in his paraphrase helps out the apostle's text. "His nature," says this learned expositor, "has a transcendent excellency superior to any thing that is made. From him were derived the visible *splendour of the celestial luminaries, the sun, the moon, and the stars, even all the hosts of these lower heavens*, and from him the yet brighter glories of invisible and angelic beings," &c. So saith Dr. Doddridge, but so said not the apostle Paul, nor any thing like it. It was very natural for the ingenious and pious paraphrast to enumerate sensible objects when specifying in detail the works of Christ, for he believed Christ to be the creator of the material universe and its inhabitants. It would have

been equally natural for the apostle to have given the same detail, had his creed coincided with that of his expositor. We may be assured, therefore, that his judgment was different. Paul knew of no proper Creator but the eternal God.

In the figurative language of scripture, the expressions, *heaven and earth*, sometimes denote *civil* distinctions, such as high and low, governors and governed: Joel ii. 10. Hag. ii. 6, 7. Acts ii. 19. Rev. vi. 12—15. Sometimes they signify *moral* distinctions, such as Jew and Gentile, a state of privilege or the contrary. Matt. xi. 13. Eph. i. 2. ii. 14. To *create*, is to introduce a new state of being, and order of things into the civil or moral world, Isa. xliii. 1. lxiii. 19. The state into which Jews and heathens were introduced by the profession of Christianity is called a new creation. Eph. ii. 10. Col. iii. 10. Christ the image, or representative of the invisible God, has been the instrument of divine goodness in accomplishing this new creation, and is himself the chief and the first born, being the first person who was raised from the dead to an immortal life*.

The distinction of thrones, dominions, &c. implies nothing more than that the dispensation introduced by Christ should be productive of great changes among persons of every rank in life, and in every description of society. See upon this subject Dr. Priestley's answer to Dr. Price, p. 117, and Mr. Tyrwhitt's excellent Essay on the creation of all things by Jesus Christ.

v. Philip ii. 5—8. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion like a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

This is the last passage which my friend produces in defence of his system, and indeed if the public version is to be taken as

* Of a certain person, who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France, is a being of superior order to mankind, much less that he is the maker of the world? The language which is true of Buonaparte in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral view—but it no more implies pre-existence, or proper creative power in one case, than in the other.

the standard of truth, there is an end of the controversy: Arians and Unitarians are both driven out of the field, for the humble prophet of Nazareth thinks it no robbery to be equal with God. Here then my worthy friend takes the liberty to correct the common translation, and renders the apostle's words, p. 170, "he *did not aspire to be as God*, he did not aim at any higher glory and power than what he possessed." But he argues, that "his being made in the likeness of men is mentioned as a proof of his humility, which it could not be, if he never existed in any other form."

It may be said of this, as of a former text, that if the pre-existence of Christ had been already established upon clear and independent evidence, this passage might be fairly understood as alluding to that amazing event, but it will by no means of itself prove the Arian doctrine, because it admits of a very easy and satisfactory interpretation upon the supposition of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ.

Christ was "in the form of God," as being the messenger and ambassador of God to man, and invested with miraculous powers superior to any which had ever been conferred upon any other human being.

"He thought it no robbery to be as God," which is in fact, the literal translation of the words, (See Schleusner,) that is, he did not consider himself as acting improperly or unjustly, in exercising these divine powers according to his discretion. Or, if the other interpretation be preferred, he did not affect an ostentatious display of his miraculous powers, as if they were a prize, or a trophy gained in war.

"He divested himself" of these powers, not by actually resigning them, but by making no use of them for his own personal advantage. The expression is analogous to that, 2 Cor. viii. 9, being rich he led a life of poverty. This is the sense in which both Arians and Trinitarians must understand the text, unless they will maintain that God, or the divine Logos, absolutely deprived himself of his essential attributes, when he became incarnate, which is absurd, and impossible.

"He assumed the appearance of a servant;" his outward aspect was mean and servile: "being in the likeness of men," or, as Mr. Wakefield very properly supplies the text, "of *other* men." Possessed of godlike powers he appeared like a being of superior order; but declining all ostentatious display of them, he appeared like a man, so that in his external form, in his habits and manners, you would not distinguish him from any *other* man, even of the humblest station in life.

The only difficulty here, arises from inattention to the Jewish idiom, in which the mark of distinction is omitted where the connexion requires it to be supplied. Thus Judges, xvi. 7. Sampson said if they shall bind me, I shall become weak, and be as a man; where the public version very properly supplies the word *another*, as it also does, v. 11. 13. 15, and ought unquestionably to have supplied it here.

My friend declines pursuing the argument any further. "Many other passages of scripture," (says he, p. 171.) "might be quoted, but I have produced only those which appear to me most decisive and sufficient to establish the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ." I am happy to agree with my friend that these are the passages in which *his great strength lies*, and that if these do not establish the pre-existence of Christ, and that he is the creator and supporter of all things, no other passages will prove it. How far they are conclusive to this point, every reader must judge for himself. In my estimation, as arguments for Arianism, they are empty as the bubble, and lighter than air*.

My worthy friend, though he has read Dr. Priestley's works, has not condescended to notice an argument, which that learned and indefatigable inquirer has advanced, and which, in the opinion of many competent judges, is fatal to the Arian hypothesis. It is, that Arianism, by which I mean the doctrine, that the spirit which animated the body of Christ was a creature of God, and employed by him as his instrument in making and governing the world, was absolutely unknown in the christian church till the beginning of the fourth century, when to the amazement and dismay of the whole orthodox world, it was first broached by a subtle and learned presbyter of Alexandria. I will venture to say that few facts in history are better authenticated than this, nor has it to my

* Let it be remembered, that it is not at all incumbent upon the Unitarians to produce a formal proof of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ. For who is so unreasonable as to expect arguments to prove a man, to be a man, and not a super-human being? But if any one asserts that a person who appears in a human form and subject to all the incidents of human nature is the creator of the world, it rests with him to prove this extraordinary assumption, and if the arguments are not clear and decisive, it follows of course, that the being who appears, and feels, and acts, and suffers as a man, is a proper human being. It is however remarkable that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, in the second chapter, sets himself professedly to prove that the Leader of salvation could not be a spirit of superior order, but must be a proper human being, a man in all respects like to his brethren: though superior to all former prophets and messengers of God, who are called upon, chap. i. 6, to pay homage to Christ, upon his resurrection from the grave, by a figure similar to that by which the departed heroes, Isa. xiv. are summoned to meet and address the king of Babylon upon his descent to Hades, the grand receptacle of the mighty dead.

knowledge, ever been disputed, since the evidence for it was produced by Dr. Priestley, in his *History of Early Opinions*. Now, that the true doctrine concerning the person of Christ should never have been understood till three hundred years after his advent, when it was accidentally discovered by an obscure Egyptian priest, appears to me in the highest degree improbable and incredible, and therefore Arianism cannot be true. But even this difficulty is no stumbling-block in the way of our Arian brethren. If they cannot remove it, they can step over it; and on they go, content and satisfied, with an *intrepidity* of faith, which bids defiance to obstacles, and can remove mountains*. And truly as this great doctrine of an incarnate creator is not hinted at by three of the evangelists, and only incidentally mentioned by Paul, it cannot be thought surprising that it was not completely understood till the fourth century, a period celebrated for many other equally notable and edifying discoveries.

Having thus shewn, as I originally proposed, both that my worthy friend has just ground for the diffidence which he expresses in his own opinions, (see *Dedication*, p. 3.) and that the Unitarians are not unwarranted in their confident belief in the proper humanity of their venerated Master, a confidence which increases in proportion to their increasing attention to the sacred records of his life and doctrine, I now take my leave of the controversy. I do not think it necessary to follow my friend into the detail of his argument in favour of what is commonly called the atonement of Christ, because the doctrine of our Lord's simple humanity cuts up this enormous corruption of his religion by the roots, at once. The true summary of Christianity is expressed by the apostle Paul in plain and clear language in his admirable address to the Athenians, Acts xvii. 31, "that God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance to all men by raising him from the dead." No notice is here taken of the death of Christ. This event, indeed, was only necessary as a preliminary to his resurrection. And to avoid all suspicion and all possibility of collusion, it was requisite that Christ should be put to death publicly and by his enemies. But as the crucifixion of Jesus as a malefactor was an event exceedingly obnoxious both to Jews and Gentiles, the apostles were solicitous to mention it in those terms, and to represent it under those figures which would have the greatest tendency to abate the prejudices

* It has been remarked, not without some appearance of reason, that faith in modern times possesses far greater power, than it did in the apostolic age. It could then only *remove* mountains, but now it can *swallow* them.

of their hearers. Accordingly, the Christian dispensation is sometimes described as a covenant, and Christ is the victim by whose blood that covenant was ratified. Again, the Gentiles being in an uncovenanted state, and the Jews having forfeited their covenant privileges, they are both represented as ceremonially sinners, and Christ is said to have died for sinners because by the gospel dispensation, Jews and Gentiles are both brought into a covenant state and made ceremonially holy, by believing in him as the Messiah. In the epistle to the Romans, Christ is compared to the mercy seat, and it is sprinkled with his own blood. In the epistle to the Corinthians, the Christian dispensation is a passover feast, in which Christ is the paschal lamb, and his doctrine the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. In the epistle to the Hebrews, Jesus is represented as the high priest of the new dispensation, and being of the tribe of Judah and not of the family of Aaron, it was necessary that he should be consecrated, as Aaron was, with blood; but his priesthood being superior to that of Aaron, required the blood of a superior victim, and that victim was himself. Who does not see that these representations could never be intended to be understood literally, but were figurative exhibitions of the death of Christ, and intended to abate the violent prejudices of unbelievers, but especially those of the Jews against the doctrine of a crucified Messiah?

My friend gives a most curious illustration of his notion of an atonement, p. 202, by supposing a "wise and good king" to put his beloved son to death, in order to convince penitent rebels, whom he intended to receive into favour, how much he was offended at their treason and rebellion, and how little they could expect forgiveness if they should rebel a second time. This would have been thought an odd method either of conciliating or intimidating the Irish rebels after the late rebellion, and its success must surely have been very problematical. Whether our own wise and good sovereign may or may not think fit to avail himself of my worthy friend's patriotic suggestion upon any future similar occasion, (which God grant may be very remote), it is not for me to say*. But of this I am

* My friend's imaginary *wise and good king* is supposed to possess the power of raising his beloved son to life, which our real one does not. This however makes little difference in the case so far as the rebels would be concerned. But though the worthy author is entitled to great credit for the originality and ingenuity of his invention, I suspect that our modern statesmen who profess so much deference to the wisdom of our ancestors, would regard it as a hazardous experiment, and would probably resort to the old and tried method of punishing some of the ringleaders, and pardoning the rest.

confident that no such strange expedient as is here described, is to be found in the Christian scriptures. One text indeed my friend produces to countenance his hypothesis upon which ignorant persons may be excused for laying considerable stress, but which a person of my friend's abilities and learning should have been ashamed to allege, and which I am persuaded that upon reconsideration, he will regret that he has cited. It is Rom. iii. 25. "Whom God has set forth as a *propitiation* through faith in his blood to declare at this time his righteousness." My friend, if he recollects himself, must know that the word rendered *propitiation* invariably signifies a mercy sent; and that whether the doctrine of atonement be true or false, this text has nothing to do with it. The design of the apostle evidently is to represent Jesus Christ as the mercy-seat, upon which the divine goodness as it were, takes its stand and declares its purposes of mercy to mankind.

But it is time to draw to the conclusion of a discussion in which I have been so unexpectedly and unintentionally engaged. At the same time I confess that I was not reluctant to embrace the opportunity of entering my public and graven protest against the Arian system with which I am so far from desiring to enter into compromise, that I regard it as a corruption of the Christian doctrine which in the enormity of its nature, and in the magnitude of its evil consequences, is little short of Trinitarianism itself. It is indeed in some respects more dangerous than even the doctrine of the trinity. For Trinitarianism in every shape, and in every explanation of it, is so palpably absurd, that no ability, no learning, no eloquence, can veil its deformity from the inquisitive mind when once emancipated from the shackles of early prepossession. But Arianism, though equally unfounded in reason and in scripture, and though it is clogged with innumerable and insurmountable difficulties, does not, *primâ facie*, involve a contradiction. Genuine Arianism is at best polytheism, and if it is accompanied with the worship of Christ, as in all consistency it ought, it is idolatry. It becomes every one therefore who is concerned for the purity of the Christian religion, to separate himself from this glaring error, against which I am persuaded that the apostles and the first teachers of christianity would have raised aloud their warning voice of it had shewn itself in the primitive Church; but it had no existence till some centuries afterwards. It is in vain to urge that many who have embraced this doctrine have been and are men eminent for talents and learning, men of serious piety and of exemplary benevolence. I grant it with pleasure; and the same

may be affirmed of many Trinitarians, and many Catholics. But this is no apology for their errors. It is the errors, and not the men against which we wage hostilities, and which we desire to exterminate, that so in "the Church of Christ there may be neither spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing." And "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual," they are not dungeons, racks, and flames, but reason, scripture, and ecclesiastical antiquity. And these weapons will, we trust, be mighty through God to pull down the strong holds of error, however numerous and powerful its partizans, and however proudly it may tower aloft and bid defiance to the artillery of truth.

I am however here speaking of genuine Arianism only, such as my friend in his lectures, in a manly way avows and defends, and not of the doctrine of the simple pre-existence of Christ, which has of late years usurped the name. But the abettors of this doctrine, have no more right to call themselves Arians, than to call themselves Gentoos, and they ought not to apply to themselves, what may be justly alleged of true Arianism, for it does not belong to them. It is not indeed easy to conceive, why they chuse to assume a name with which their tenets so little correspond; unless it be to screen themselves from the reproach that is annexed to the obnoxious term Socinian, which to the ears of some is more offensive than the once *dreaded name of Demogorgon*: and perhaps to save the credit of their orthodoxy, by joining occasionally in the popular hue-and-cry against those who profess the primitive faith of the proper humanity of Jesus Christ.

Genuine Arianism is not and cannot be Unitarianism; for it believes in two Gods, a great God and a lesser one, and in two Creators, one supreme, and the other subordinate. But these modern non-descripts, these *demi-semi-arians*, if so they may be called, are Unitarians in as strict a sense, as those who believe that Jesus Christ had no existence before he was born of his mother Mary. A mere difference of opinion concerning the date of our Lord's existence, bears no more relation to proper Unitarianism, than the controversy concerning his miraculous conception. The principal objections against this new doctrine of simple pre-existence are, that it is improbable, unnecessary, unscriptural, and perfectly modern. It is the puny birth of the eighteenth century, and certainly can never live through the nineteenth. But with regard to its consequences, it seems as harmless, as it is nugatory.

My friend with whom I have engaged in this controversy I

have long known to be a person of excellent understanding, and of great moral worth, an assiduous and faithful minister of the gospel, respected and beloved by all who have the pleasure of knowing him. I willingly bear this testimony to his character, because I am apprehensive that in the course of the discussion, I have sometimes thought it necessary, in justice to the subject, to advance some remarks which may have been unpleasant to his feelings. It is difficult in controversy to observe a proper medium; and language is sometimes taken in a sense different from what the writer expects and intends. If therefore any expressions of asperity have occurred beyond the limits of propriety, I hope that my friend will excuse them, and will regard them as intended wholly for his system, and not personally to himself. I have not intentionally misrepresented his meaning; and if I am convicted of mistake, I shall thankfully retract. I seek not for victory but for truth, and I esteem no triumph more honourable than the correction of error, and no acquisition more valuable, than that of moral and religious truth.

And now, Sir, with many thanks to yourself, and to your numerous readers, for the indulgence I have experienced, and with earnest wishes for the increasing success of your liberal and useful Repository,

Hackney,
Nov. 9, 1807.

I am your obliged Servant,
T. BELSHAM.

POETRY.

PROLOGUE TO A THEATRICAL EXHIBITION,

AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF A SCHOOL - VACATION.

Spoken by one of the Scholars.

Ladies! I know they tell me but the truth,
That you will listen nor despise our youth;
They tell me too that manhood will attend,
And kindly lose the censor in the friend,
Recal the years departed, and enjoy
Again, the first ambition of a boy.

Yes! we aspire upon this narrow stage,
The gay to interest, nor disgust the sage;
Yet our's no critic fury to appease,
Your smiles await the honest wish to please.

And O! when time has borne us on his wing,
O'er the short months of Nature's moral spring;
Be our's an equal ardour of the mind,
To fill with dignity the task assign'd;
In the low vale, or on the heights of fame,
To cherish virtue's heaven-enkindled flame;
Anxious, in Life's great drama, to appear
Correct, and credit our rehearsals here;
And while around tumultuous passions rage,
Act the good part, for—"all the world's a stage."

H. N.

TO THE NIGHTINGALE.

What time the crimson cloud of light,
On Ocean's bosom rests its beam;
When Hesper shews his golden gem,
And ushers in the night:

What time the Sun's declining rays,
Beneath Night's dusky mantle fail;
Then Philomela tells her tale,
To Cynthia's sacred face.

Say, tuneful songster, why alone
Refuse to join the feather'd throng,
And mingle with their sprightly song,
The beauties of thine own?

But to the thicket-shades withdrawn,
Thou shun'st the piercing beam of day;
Nor ever tun'st thy artless lay,
To hail th' approach of morn.

But when the night with sable veil,
Has cloth'd in black the mountain-heads;
Ah! then what melody proceeds,
And floats on ev'ry gale.

The lover thus disdains the light,
And quits the haunts of human race;
Midst thickest gloom like thee he strays,
A songster of the night.

E. DUNCANNON, aged 18.

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

Porte.

ART. I.—*Lectures on Scripture Facts; by W. B. Collyer.*
large 8vo. pp. 593. 12s. Williams and Smith. 1807.

We are enjoined in Scripture to prove all things : even those great events recorded in the books of the Old and New Testament, upon the authority of which the whole evidence of revealed religion rests, are to be made the subject of investigation, that by examining into the internal marks of credibility which they possess, and corroborating them by foreign testimonies, we may rest our faith in them on solid grounds. In order to assist Christians in these important inquiries, learned men have employed their talents, in collecting from various quarters every thing which might seem to throw light upon the various parts of the scripture narrative. It is the laudable object of the present writer to avail himself of these learned researches, in order to present them to common readers in a more popular form, than has commonly been done; to interweave foreign testimonies to the truth of the scripture history with the discussion of the history itself; and to relieve the dryness of a series of extracts by giving the whole as much as possible, the shape and ardour of pulpit-addresses. It is but justice to Mr. C. to say that he has succeeded, by means of a lively animated manner, in giving no inconsiderable degree of interest to these discussions, and that he has been at much pains in collecting information from various respectable authors and compilers, who have written on the same subject. As an apology why he, as a young man, should come forward in an attempt, which might seem to require a depth of erudition seldom found in those of his own age, especially when their attention is a good deal confined to the labours of the pulpit, he, with equal modesty and propriety, mentions the peculiar nature of the warfare, which is now carried on by the enemies of religion. "The young, the inexperienced, the illiterate, have united with the Sage, and the Philosopher, against the claims and obligations of Revelation. Let youth be opposed to youth, age to age, talent to talent. Let it be seen that some are growing up, to support the Redeemer's kingdom, whilst others finish their course, and are gathered to their fathers." The lectures are fourteen in

number, and embrace the following subjects. The necessity of a divine Revelation. The Creation. The Deluge. The destruction of Babel, and the origin of nations. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. The history of Joseph. The nature and destination of Man. The slavery and deliverance of Israel in Egypt. The history of the Israelites in the wilderness, and their establishment in Canaan. The government of the Jews, including the Theocracy and monarchy, to the building of Solomon's temple. The captivity of Israel and Judah. The life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The character of the writers of the Old and New Testament. The analogy discoverable between the Religion of Nature, and that of the Bible in respect to partial obscurities which belong to both. Each of these discussions branches out into a number of collateral inquiries, in the course of which considerable information is afforded to the unlearned reader, and popular answers are given to popular objections. As these lectures are written, evidently under the bias of those religious sentiments commonly called Calvinistic, it cannot be expected that we should approve of every thing contained in this volume, but the allusions to doctrinal points are rare, no rancour of spirit is manifested and much good may possibly be done by the work, as it may tend to excite a spirit of inquiry amongst a class of Christians who, confining themselves to a few favourite topics, are in general little

accustomed or inclined to investigations of this nature.

Having thus paid a due tribute of applause to the good intentions and very commendable industry manifested in the volume before us, it remains that we perform our duty to the public, by pointing out some defects and errors which have met our eye in reading it.

A good cause may be injured when weak arguments or dubious facts are brought forwards in support of it. This is sometimes though not often the case in the present work. Some of the testimonies from heathen writers are much too general to build any thing upon, and had therefore better have been omitted. The quotation from Virgil's *Pollio*, so far from affording a proof that it was an imitation of the prophet, is cited by Pope in a note to his beautiful poem of the *Messiah*, with a contrary design, to shew how inferior Virgil is to the inspired writer. A little farther inquiry will convince Mr. C. that the passage from Josephus can be nothing better than a designed interpolation, and that no serious evidence to the truth of the earthquake at the time of our Saviour's death, can be collected from the clefts of the earth shewn by the monks of the Church of the Sepulchre, any more than from the pieces of the cross which they sell to the superstitious vulgar. Our author, in drawing a picture of the manners and morals of the heathens at the time of the appearance of Christ, is unjust in saying that courage was their only generally allowed virtue; certainly

the virtues of patriotism, contempt of gain, compassion and other qualities of the shewy kind, were in high estimation. He says that at this period, science had unveiled her splendours, and irradiated the discovered globe, from pole to pole. When Mr. C. flourishes in this way, is he forgetful, or is he ignorant, that science, though not literature, was then in its infancy, and that the globe, which is now very imperfectly known, could then hardly be said to be known at all? In enumerating the evils arising from the civil institutions then prevalent, he forgets to mention domestic slavery and the liberty of divorce.

Some inaccuracies of style might be pointed out, which, if the work come to a second edition, should be corrected. In two or three instances the word *each* is made the nominative of a plural verb. Esau is called a *fratricide*, though *fratricide* means the murder not the murderer of a brother. A *tract* of country is more than once called a *track*. Instead of saying that this or that event occurred or took place, our author constantly uses the word *transpired*, which has by no means the same signification.

Something too much like affectation and parade may be observed in some parts. The lectures are preceded by a long list of writers, whom Mr. C. is supposed to have been studying deeply for the purpose of obtaining information from them, several of whom have no written remains whatever, and concerning one in particular, Orpheus, whose exact date is here assigned, it is quite uncertain whe-

ther any such person ever existed. Many examples occur of that kind of *prettiness* of manner, which makes the vulgar stare and the judicious grieve. For instance, describing in flowery language Abraham intending to offer up Isaac, he breaks off, saying, "But we will no longer attempt to scent the violet and to paint the rainbow." When he is admiring the concise terms in which the death of Joseph and of the whole of that generation is mentioned by the historian, he exclaims, "One should imagine that Moses had snatched a feather from the wing of time to record the swiftness of his flight and the rapidity of his desolation." In some places our author appears to deviate from the humble pretensions with which he sets out, and assumes the tone of a veteran critic, to whom the opinion of the world may be expected to bow. "We wish it to be understood as our decided opinion that at the destruction of Babel a new language was introduced, and this by the miraculous and immediate interposition of divine power."

It may admit of a doubt, whether our author's distinction between statutes, commandments, judgments and testimonies, as used in the Old Testament, will hold good. The terms seem often to be used indiscriminately. Instances may be produced, where statutes cannot be confined to positive institutions, as where David says, "Thy statutes have been my song in the house of my pilgrimage." In Levit. iv. 13, the word commandments seems applied peculiarly to the Levitical ri-

tual. Judgments and statutes in various passages of the Psalms, particularly. cxix, 7, 36, mean the moral law.

The principles which our author espouses, lead him not unfrequently to allude to the doctrine of the depravity of human nature, by which they who are reputed orthodox, mean, that we are by nature averse to all that is good, and prone to every thing evil and wicked. And yet, whatever a man's system may be, so difficult it is to conceive of mankind as otherwise than compassionate and tender-hearted, when

they follow the impulse of nature, and as cruel only when they stifle its voice, that this author himself, speaking of the barbarity which the sons of Jacob shewed towards their brother, exclaims, "Surely in their bosom nothing human was left undestroyed;" and again, in p. 257, referring to the chief butler of king Pharaoh, he says, "Nature was not dead within him, and humanity pleaded for one so young, so kind, and so injured as Joseph." Surely then poor human nature is not quite so vile as we sometimes hear it represented. B.

ART. II.—*Horæ Ecclesiasticæ. Practical Essays, in a Series of Reflections, on Documents of the United Church.* By the Rev. James Harriman Hutton. Vol. i. 12mo. pp. 194. Rivingtons.

"These Essays lay no claim to novelty of invention, nor are they marked by the labours of dispute. There is something noble and commanding in truth: she needs but little the aid of argument, and looks as if she ought to be believed. I deem it no inglorious occupation to have selected fair and venerable forms of truth." Pref. p. 6.

This rant is continued throughout the whole volume, which contains Essays, as they are called, on the Articles of the Church of England, the divine Attributes and Revelation. A ray of good sense, however, now and then breaks through the author's inanity and obscurity, and the tenor of his reflections, as far as we understand them, is temperate, though orthodox. He is never dull for many pages together, for when he is unintelligible, he is happily ridiculous.

VOL. II.

4 K

Mr. Hutton adduces "the talents of Divines and Divines' friends," as a recommendation at least of revealed religion. "They have proved themselves not inadequate to their work. They have yielded neither to physicians in sagacity, nor to lawyers in research. They have always been legitimate scholars of the best habits and education; occasionally, they have been arbiters of taste and votaries of general science." "Hebrew and Greek scholars, Chemists and Mineralogists. Astronomers and natural Philosophers. 'Live in numbers and in song,' excel in painting, in music, and in mathematics, are of the first value to their country as heads of colleges and schools; have acquired an insight into nautical affairs and the *Mores Hominum*, from their nationally important services as chaplains." pp. 139, 140.

Another notable argument in favour of revelation is,

"That its principles are cherished also in the system of the law. This appears by the respect shewn to these principles in our Inns of Court, and their intimate connexion with the practice of the law itself. From the sovereignty to the lowest office, all is built upon religion."

Bravo! Fiction, chicanery and perjury, are evidences of the truth, attestations to the excellence of religion.

But the best arguments are to come. They are, reader, "the memory of the Christian Judge, Lord Kenyon," and "the last moments of Mr. Pitt himself," which, says the author, "present us with all the resignation and dignity of a true believer, and are with us instead of many arguments!!" What if Kenyon were covetous, profane and brutal, and Pitt were an habitual drunkard and a duellist, they promoted and flattered Churchmen; and the Church, we know, has power to forgive sins and is the keeper of the keys of heaven. Lords Howick and Erskine will never be cited after their decease, unless they should come into power again before they die, as witnesses to the reality of vital religion!

In a note, the author gives "on authority," an account of Mr. Pitt's last moments. We shall extract it, stating only beforehand, that the picture of the late prime minister's death-bed which was circulated among the distant crowd,

the *profanum vulgus*, was somewhat different. In that he is represented as having been for some days previous to his decease in a state of insensibility, from which he was with difficulty roused at intervals. It further describes the dignitary who attended him as offering up on the approach of death to administer to him the all-atoning sacrament. The answer ascribed to the dying statesmen is memorable:—"P———n you know as well as I do that in my situation that ceremony would be of no avail." We have no high authorities to vouch for our statement, but we think it contains more internal probability than Mr. Hutton's, which we now lay before the reader.

"Mr. Pitt died in Jan. 1806, having been attended at his death by his venerable friend who had also been his tutor, the Bishop of Lincoln. He heard with fortitude of the approaching crisis, and expressed, in the strongest terms, his sense of the truths of revealed religion—of his own unworthiness—and of his reliance on the merits of Christ. He declared that he died in peace with all mankind. This great man's *hates* were all public ones. He had no personal animosity. *I am able to assure the reader, from authority, of the truth of this note.*" p. 139.

A numerous list of subscribers prefixed to this volume, shews that the author has been very assiduous in courting patronage, or that he is highly deserving of it.

ART. III.—A Brief Account of the Proceedings of the Committee, appointed by the yearly meeting of Friends, held in Baltimore, for promoting the Improvement and Civilization of the Indian natives. 8vo. pp. 47. Phillips and Fardon, 1806.

ART. IV.—*A Brief Account of the Proceedings of the Committee, appointed in the year 1795, by the yearly meeting of Friends, of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, &c. for promoting the Improvement and Gradual Civilization of the Indian natives.* 8vo. pp. 48. Phillips and Fardon. 1806.

THESE pamphlets contain accounts of two missions of civilization, undertaken by the Quakers of America among their Indian neighbours: the first instances on record of a religious body attempting to civilize, without any immediate design of converting, the Heathen. The success of the attempt, contrasted with the failure of the Otaheitan and other missions, confirms us in the opinion, we have always entertained, that a considerable degree of civilization, and of social and mental improvement, is absolutely necessary to the reception of Christianity. The gospel is superior to Pagan superstitions, in the first place, only so far as it is more reasonable, or in other words as it contains more truth; and in the second place, inasmuch only as it supplies more powerful motives to virtue. But the mind of a savage is not sufficiently opened to distinguish truth from error, or to perceive the beauty of the one and the deformity of the other; nor his heart sufficiently softened to feel the force of purely spiritual motives. How can he sin in whose mind are associated scarcely more ideas than are found in that of a child of two years old, "reason upon righteousness, temperance and judgment to come?" How can he who in the summer is unmindful of, and

makes no provision for, the approach of winter, be expected to live under the habitual influence of the hope of a future life? Experience may however supersede argument; for there is no example in the history of the world, of any considerable number of barbarians, really such, becoming permanent Christians, without passing through the intermediate stage of civilization. Those who are so denominated in the New Testament, were not barbarous in our acceptation of the term, that is, uncivilized, wild and savage, but merely foreigners to the Greeks and Romans, in whose haughty modes of speech a person of an unknown or distant nation was designated as a barbarian, a stranger as an enemy.—The negro listens to an European missionary with deference and respect, and is in some measure obedient to him, because he is an European; but let him withdraw and leave the negro to himself, and the supposed convert will relapse into an idolater. The South-sea-islander receives the Christian propagandist with courtesy and attention, because he associates with the person of the missionary the idea of riches; but let him once perceive that his instructor has exhausted his wealth, and has no more tools or trinkets, iron or glass, and it is well if he permits him to dwell

in safety. When one of the missionaries in Oraheite reproached a native for not coming to hear the word of God so regularly as at a former period, the islander reminded him that, though he still offered him plenty of the word, he gave him no more hatchets.

The American Quakers have proved, however, that if it be next to impossible to make barbarians Christians, it is comparatively easy to render them social and civilized. The success of the efforts recorded in these tracts, though not extraordinary, is satisfactory and encouraging. The greatest difficulty will be experienced in the outset of such philanthropic missions. If one tribe or even family of wandering Indians be induced to settle and to practise agriculture and the arts, other families and tribes, seeing their prosperity and comfort, will follow their example; and an Indian missionary, whether of civilization or religion, will be most likely to convert Indians. The Friends of Baltimore avow their expectation, which we think extremely reasonable, that when their rude neighbours have been formed into civilized society it will not be difficult to incorporate them into the Christian church.

The North American Indians appear from these accounts to be greatly reduced in number. The scanty territory which is left them in the back settlements is insufficient to supply subsistence to nations of hunters, and population always bears a direct ratio to the means of life. They have been much thinned also by the novel and fatal diseases introduced among them by the Anglo-

Americans; and much more by the thirst which they have caught from these new-comers for spirituous liquors, the immoderate use of which was described by one of themselves to their Quaker visitors, as being more destructive than the gun or the tomahawk. Another cause perhaps of the reduction of their numbers is their custom of devolving all laborious employment upon their women, who of course are the more oppressed with labour as they become fewer, and as subsistence becomes more difficult; and who from this cause are less prolific, and less desirous of children and less attentive to them. So deeply rooted is this custom that Indian men, respectable from age or rank, are ashamed to be seen at work by the women, who, in their turn, do not fail to ridicule such of them as are so feminine as to apply to hard labour.

The Indians have been hitherto kept down in point of civilization by the persuasion, which has not been discouraged by the white people who have chiefly traded with them, that they are an inferior race of beings. But whilst they look up with a kind of awe to the civilized intruders on their lands, they are not insensible to their vices. Their prepossession in favour of Quakers, as being an exception, in point of morality, from their brethren, is well known. One of their chiefs asked the committee of Friends, with a degree of anxiety, and with prefatory apologies which bespoke the sentiments of his heart very forcibly, "Whether Quakers kept slaves!"

The pleasure which the Indians

experience on first feeling the they find a pearl of great price. practical benefit of their industry An ingenious Indian, after having is so great, as to remind us al. a grist of wheat, of his own most of the joy of the first con- raising, ground and bolted, said verts to Christianity. In the with animation, "I think this will knowledge of the arts of life, make the Indians see day light!"

OBITUARY.

*Mr. George Paton.—Matthew Guthrie, M. D. F. R. S. S.—M. Blin de St. More.—
Rev. Lewis James.—Mrs. Peppen.—William Roberts, Esq.—Mr. Clark.—
Mr. Kirk.—Mrs. Piaba Tyley.*

May, at Edinburgh, aged 86. Mr. GEORGE PATON, a clerk in the Custom House. He had acquired a valuable library, particularly on subjects connected with the antiquities, history and topography of North Britain. Mr. Gough the Editor of the new editions of the British Topography, and of Camden's Britannia, has very handsomely acknowledged himself indebted to Mr. P. for much useful information. He had a brother who was minister of Eckfechan, and died lately possessed also of a valuable library.

Aug. 7, at St. Petersburg, MATTHEW GUTHRIE, M. D. F. R. S. S. Lond. and Edin. Physician to the imperial corps of Noble Cadets in that city, and counsellor of state. He was a native of Scotland, and went early in life into the medical service of Russia.

Sept. at Paris, suddenly, while entering his cabinet, aged 64, M. BLIN de ST. MORE, author of several tragedies and poems. The Emperor had lately appointed him librarian to the arsenal.

Sept. 9, at Blane-Ivor, near Caerfilly, aged 87, the Rev. LEWIS JAMES, upwards of 50 years pastor of the Baptist Church at Cevan-Hengoed, in the parish of Gellygore, in Glamorganshire.

Sept. 21, at Hillingdon, Mrs. PEP- PEN, a lineal descendent of Sir Thomas More, to whose portrait in her latter years, she was supposed to bear a strong resemblance.

Sept. 23, at Stanmore, in consequence of a fall down the cliffs in the Isle of Wight, aged 80, WILLIAM ROBERTS, Esq. formerly master of a school at Wandsworth, at which several public characters were educated and from which he had retired for some years. He was elder brother to Dr. Roberts, who has been for nearly 40 years head master of St. Paul's School. Mr. R. had the reputation of very re-

spectable classical attainments. He was of an athletic form, and had accustomed himself to take food only once a day, at the hour of dinner. His wife died four days before him.

Sept. 25, at Northampton, aged 70, after a few days illness, Mr. CLARK, distributor of stamps for that county. He was the last surviving son of Dr. Samuel Clark, dissenting Minister of St. Albans, who died in 1750, and had been the intimate friend of Doddridge. Mr. C.'s place is said to be worth from 800 to 1000l. per annum, and that the business might be done for 100l. His death therefore affords a very fair opportunity for economy in this department.

Sept. aged 88, Mr. KIRK, watch engraver, better known by the name of "Water Kirk." He never experienced any serious illness till within a few hours of his death; and from a religious principle never tasted animal food, nor any liquor but water. He was a great antiquary, and formerly a celebrated field preacher.

October 29, at Wedmore, Somerset, after a short but severe illness, MRS. PHOEBE TYLEY, aged 68, a member of the General Baptist Congregation in that place. She was a lady distinguished for the simplicity of her manners, the sincerity of her piety, and the extent of her benevolence and hospitality. Though her religious connexion exposed her to the ridicule and even frowns of some gay and opulent relatives, yet she remained inflexible in her determination to follow her convictions, and, like Moses, appeared ready to prefer affliction with the people of God, to the momentary and delusive pleasures of sin. Her loss will be severely felt by the little society she was connected with, as she was unremitting in her attention to its welfare, and liberally contributed to its support. D. J.

*Rev. John P. F. I. Plurquette.—Rev. Mr. Braithwaite.—Sir Brook Watson.—
Rev. William Gordon, D. D.*

Sept. at Wappenbury, Warwickshire, aged 41, the Rev. John P. F. I. PLURQUETTE, fifteen years officiating priest to the Catholic congregation of that place. He was born at Caen in Normandy, educated in one of the universities of his native country, and after leading a military life for a short time was ordained a priest in 1792. He had a prospect of enjoying an ample fortune till the Revolution in 1793, when he took refuge in England, and was appointed to the charge of the catholic congregation at Wappenbury. Mr. P. possessed a benevolent heart, an amiable temper and agreeable manners. Though attached to the doctrines and ceremonies of his church, he indulged none of those principles which have been so unjustly imputed to the modern Catholics because they were professed by their ancestors in former ages.

Sept. 30, the Rev. Mr. BRAITHWAITE, minister of Hatton Chapel, London, in the 33d year of his age. On Tuesday, Oct. 13, his remains were conveyed from the chapel (where they had lain during the preceding sabbath,) in a hearse drawn by four horses and attended by his friends in twenty-four mourning coaches to Blackfriars Church, where they were deposited in a vault, adjoining to that of the late Rev. Mr. Romaine. Mr. B. who was a Calvinist of the Supra-lapsarian or Antinomian kind, was one of the most popular preachers in London, crowds attending his ministry. He was distinguished by a bold manner, by a turn for typifying and allegorizing, and by eccentricity and oddity. He might, if his life had been prolonged, have been as important a man, in the religious world, as the well-known W. Huntington.

Oct. 2, at East Sheen, Surry, aged 71, SIR BROOK WATSON, Bart. Alderman of London, and Deputy Governor of the Bank. He was descended from a family in Yorkshire, and born at Plymouth in 1735. His first destination was for the sea-service, but having his right leg bitten off by a shark while bathing at the Havannah, he devoted himself at the age of fourteen to mercantile pursuits, in which he was eminent and much respected. He was also employed by the government during many years as a commissary. In

this office he has gained a high character for integrity, and is said to have attended so little to his personal emolument as to have left a very small property besides his paternal inheritance. As a magistrate and a member of parliament he generally appeared rather the dutiful servant of the crown than the zealous guardian of the people. This might be expected from his long and intimate connexion with the government. His character has been thus drawn in one of the public prints: "He was, through life, to his king and country a constitutional, loyal subject; a diligent, zealous, and faithful servant; a firm, upright, and merciful magistrate; to his wife a most affectionate and tender husband; to his relations a kind and substantial friend; in his friendships constant; in faith a firm Christian; in deeds a benevolent, honest man."

October 19th, at Ipswich, the Rev. WILLIAM GORDON, D. D. He was a native of Hitchin, in Hertfordshire, and had his academical education in London, under Dr. Marryatt. He was early settled as pastor of a large independent church at Ipswich, where he continued in good esteem many years, but removed in consequence of some uneasiness, at first occasioned by his dissatisfaction with one of his principal hearers, who employed his work-men on government business, on the Lord's day. On the death of Dr David Jennings, he was chosen to be his successor, in the Church at Old-Gravel-Lane, Wapping. Here he might have continued much respected, but in 1771, his partiality to America induced him to force himself away in order to settle in that country, where he became pastor of a church at Jamaica-plain, near Boston. There he took a very active part in public measures during the war with Great Britain, and was chosen chaplain to the provincial Congress. While in that office he preached and published a fast sermon which strongly expressed his political sentiments, on Isaiah i. 26.

He received his diploma from the college of New Jersey, from whence he procured one also for his friend Mr. Samuel Wilton, then minister at Tooting, whose father was a deacon of the church in Old Gravel-Lane, and who maintained a correspondence with him.

Rev. W. Gordon, D. D.—Mr. Abraham Newland.

Dr. Gordon soon found America not to be that holy land which he had expected. The war had an unhappy effect on the morals of the people, and some of his hearers borrowed money of him which he could not recover. It was also believed that his warm interference in political matters gave disgust to some of the men in power. So that after the termination of the war, he was glad to return to his native country. He at first spent some months in London, where he had many friends, though some of them received him coolly. At length he got a settlement, but much inferior to either of his former, at St. Neots, in Huntingdonshire, the place where Mr. David Edwards had been minister, who succeeded him at Ipswich. The congregation which was but low, gradually declined, in consequence of his want of that popular address they had been used to, and the decrease of his mental powers, which at length was so visible that his friends advised his resignation; and raised a subscription for him. Upon this he returned to Ipswich, where he had some agreeable connexions left. Here he preached a few occasional sermons, but his memory soon failed him to such a degree, as to unfit him for all public service. Though his sight continued so good that he could read without glasses, which he did to the last with great avidity, he appeared to know little, and to retain nothing of what he read. He lost all recollection of his most intimate friends; nor did he remember even the name of Washington, with whom he had been acquainted and had held a correspondence.

Dr. Gordon married the sister of Messrs. Field the bookseller, and the apothecary, both of London, but never had any family. Mrs. Gordon survives but has totally lost her sight. The Dr. was in sentiment a strict Calvinist, but liberal, and of a very sociable disposition. He possessed good natural abilities, and was of a studious turn. Though warm in his temper, he was friendly, and often facetious. Though he was fluent in speech, he was not popular: his sermons were composed with care, but too systematical, and he had accustomed

himself to read them too slavishly. Dr. Owen was one of his favourite authors.

While he was minister at Ipswich, he published a judicious abridgment of Dr. Jonathan Edwards's Treatise on the Affections: and while in America he wrote the History of the War with this country, which was published here by subscription, in 4 large vols. 8vo. Though it is not written with elegance, it is allowed to have considerable merit, as a faithful narrative of facts, and contains many valuable and authentic copies of original papers. It is said that this work produced him three hundred pounds. He died in the 78th year of his age. His portrait, engraved some years before his death, is a most striking likeness.

S. R.

MR. ABRAHAM NEWLAND, late Chief Cashier at the Bank of England, died at his house at High-bury, on Saturday morning, Nov. 27. This respectable character was elected a clerk in the Bank on the 25th February, 1747, and appointed Chief Cashier on the 8th January, 1778. He had entered his 78th year. For some time past his health was visibly on the decline; and finding that his strength would not permit him to execute the functions of his office with his usual celerity and correctness, he resigned his situation a few weeks ago, and was succeeded by Mr. Hase. Ever since the period of his resignation he became daily more exhausted, and was thoroughly prepared for his approaching dissolution. He would often say, that before Christmas he would finish his earthly career. His last moments were not attended with the least symptom of pain. Had Mr. Newland survived a little longer, he would have been in possession of the plate assigned him by the Governor and Directors of the Bank of England, as a mark of their esteem for the faithful discharge of his duty. Mr. Newland's relations are very distant; and to them, it is presumed, he has left all his property, to the amount of about 7000*l.* per annum.

Times.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIANISM IN FRANCE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

A few months ago, I had the pleasure of recommending an extract from the Universal Magazine, upon this subject: at present I have that of congratulating you upon a more extensive and magnificent prospect of its dissemination. It is sufficient to observe, that this original, this grand and simple truth is beginning to display itself upon the Continent, under the auspices of the greatest statesman and reformer that ever distinguished the imperial purple, or the regal diadem. In this case indisputable facts and imperishable events, speak more forcibly, than any panegyric whatever, too often liable to suspicion.

Very few, the bigoted catholics, and some of the high church-politicians of this country excepted, have expressed any regret upon what the Romish superstition has suffered from the French Revolution.—But it required men whose ideas were far advanced beyond the common level, and whose minds were depurated from religious prejudice, and the tyranny of custom, to see the necessity of reforming the reformation, and of putting an end to the *Protestant*, as well as the *Papish dragon*; for binding the dæmon of persecution, and drying up the source of religious animosity, by closing the mouth of the abyss or bottomless pit of pretended mystery; and lastly, by proclaiming with the authority of an angel from Heaven, "THAT WHERE MYSTERY BEGINS, RELIGION ENDS."

This it appears is what is now in agitation in France. In an article inserted in the continental papers dated from the Banks of the Maine, Aug. 21, it is said, Our Journals contain the following article:

"There is a talk at Paris, of a closer union of the different sects of the Christian religion, agreeably to the doctrines taught by their Great Founder, and such is requisite for our enlightened age. A great reformation is intended, in par-

ticular, in the Jewish worship, and as the rights of citizens have been secured to that sect, it will be provided by wise laws that they shall renounce the old forms which separate them from their fellow citizens."

Every word of this article emanating from authority, has its weight and meaning. The phraseology of this article, if it can be allowed to have any serious object, must refer to the removal of that unfathomable source of error and confusion, that overflowing mint of mistake and mischief, the Athanasian creed, which has hitherto been equally as much a stumbling block between Jews and Christians, as between Christians themselves of different denominations. There are many reasons for giving credit to the plan now agitating in France; for as no civil society can exist without religion, and as neither the reformed Catholic religion, nor the Trinitarian Protestants, are likely to fill the pulpits, or meet the public ear in regenerated France; these considerations may have excited in that government, a disposition to adopt some other system, as it is expressed, more agreeable to the doctrines taught by the Great Founder of Christianity, and requisite for our enlightened age.

The progress that your work is making in the noble task of elevating and improving the human race, affords fresh proof that a very great portion of moral depravity in society, has arisen from our misconceptions of the character and attributes of God. The imaginary Trinity of persons that have been worshipped among the Protestants has conjointly tended to perplex the divine testimony, and deprave man who is the subject of it. In the Trinitarian systems, man is often put for God, and God for man. Hence offices have been applied to Christ absolutely foreign to his character, flattering in the end, but idolatrous in their object. Thus for instance the opinion of his judging the world, which is so justly controverted against the notion of an Arian writer in page 462 of your number for Sept. has originally arisen from not attending to the fact that whatever is spoken of Christ, in a doctrinal sense, is al-

ways more applicable to his gospel, than his person. It is therefore the gospel, and the spirit of Christ, by which men are to be judged, whether in himself, or in his members. It is in this sense alone, that Paul can speak of men being *judged by his gospel*, Rom. xi. 16. The term judgment, though condemnation generally attends it, does not necessarily imply any more than decision. As for the saints being said to judge angels as well as the world, 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, can that mean any thing more than superiors as well as inferiors are subjected to the judgment or decision of the gospel, of which the saints are both the depositaries and the organs. Does it not imply that the Angels of the Church as well as the Church itself, and the world are all subjected to this judgment? And are not temporal rulers though frequently called God's messengers or representatives on earth, subject to the same law of condemnation or acquittal? The decision or judgment pronounced by the gospel, is no respecter of persons. Hence Felix trembled—Hence Pilate the representative or Angel of the Roman government, calling for water, declared his innocence of the blood of that righteous man. In fact the administration of the last or final judgment by Christ *in person*, must be given up entirely, to understand the doctrinal scriptures aright; but to enter into the prophetic parts of the New and Old Testaments, almost all that is said of the day of judgment, resurrection &c. in them, must be understood as spoken of the nations, of which such circumstances are predicted. This is peculiar to the book of the Revelations. These national judgments are always attended by such calamities as wars, or revolutions. Then in the prophetic dialect, God may be said to have a controversy with the nations, to plead with them, &c. While treating on the subject, I am happy to find your learned correspondent in p. 463, admit that the Revelations relative to the two witnesses, Chap. xi. 16, may be quoted as scripture. I look upon the reasoning powers of Mr. T. Belsham, on this or any other controverted point, as outweighing the critical objections of half a dozen Michaelises. But even Bishop Hurd, when treating of the prophecies had, as far as concerned them only, pretty clearly established the posi-

VOL. II.

tion "that Christ will not himself, personally, bear any part in the final judgment." The application of this principle may be extended to other offices and circumstances; that of an earthly Messiah for instance, may also be executed by a delegate. There is no necessity to repeat the panegyric you have admitted upon a very exalted personage, in pages 502, 503 of your Magazine, nor do I wish here to enlarge upon the propriety of them; but in answer to the quotation, in which it is said, "Without endeavouring to find the hero in ancient prophecies as some have done, and we will not say they have done it injudiciously; without implicitly relying on those who assure us that he is the man on the white clouds in the Revelations, with a golden crown on his head, without committing ourselves to declare that he is the angel of God, commissioned for high and important purposes, though it is to be noted that the moral qualities of the agent do not prevent that epithet, being applied to him, &c. &c." I reply that though some of my own publications are evidently alluded to in these indirect charges, I do not wish to enter into any dispute upon the subject, but only to acknowledge openly and without reserve that I do sincerely believe that every one of the sublime qualifications, do actually and *bona fide*, apply to the potentate in question; for as the act of judging the world is evidently not confined to the person of Christ, surely the inferior office of being his delegate on earth, to chastise the offending nations, to prepare the way of the Lord, and make the paths straight, may be intrusted to his harbinger—to one endued with the spirit of Elijah, who among sovereigns, has done more than all his predecessors, towards "turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers;" by taking the reproach from the Jews, and in a declaration to his Protestant Dissenters becoming the first sovereign upon earth, who has acknowledged "that for religious toleration his subjects owed him no obligation: that he did not wish men to think themselves indebted to him because he had been merely just; and that CONSCIENCE IS NOT WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF HUMAN LAWS!" Now if this potentate had no other qualification to recommend

him, his religious reformation alone would constitute him an eminent precursor of the promised glorious period. At the highest crisis of the apostacy when the great and gloomy fabric of superstition had been thrown down by a mighty earthquake or revolution; when a combination of Kings and Emperors was formed to restore or preserve the dogmas of the dark ages; who, it may be asked has been able to abide the coming of this Baptizer of the nations? Who has endured the appearance of him who is like a purifying fire, or fuller's soap, and who has also purified the sons of Levi, and purged them as gold and silver, that they might bring offerings to the Lord in righteousness; and that the offerings, or worship of Judah and Jerusalem, should henceforth be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old?

We have all read of a period when kings and queens should become the foster fathers and mothers of the Church of Israel, and now we see it has arrived. We see a power who is willing to afford them protection, and who if any refuse, or still hanker after the bondage, the sacred onions, and the flesh-pots of Egypt, is able to compel them to come in also; but happily we shall find that where example prevail, there will be no occasion even for the semblance of persecution.

I could here enlarge upon the manner of this last judgment upon the nations, and shew how far the true worshippers of *One God* have contributed to, and cooperated in his great work—but considering your limits, I remain your's &c.

ANTE MERCATOR.

COBBETT,

The POOR, and the BIBLE.

A notorious political journalist, who is distinguished for the hardihood of his assertions and the fierceness of his paper assaults, has lately canvassed *Mr. Whitbread's* projected "Poor Bill." He denies with the usual effrontery of the disciples of the Windham or Bull-baiting school, that enabling the poor to read would increase their happiness, and maintains the brutal maxim, that knowledge generates more vice than virtue. In the course of his paper he is led to notice the obvious argument that a capability of reading would make a poor man master of the Bible, and thereby promote his real comfort. His reply to it is as follows:—

"At the probable effect of reading the

Bible, I before hinted; and, I think, it must be clear to every man who attentively considers the matter, *that such reading, if universal, could lead to nothing short of UNIVERSAL SCHISM, which at present, is prevented only by the general want of what may be called STUDY in reading it.*—Those among the mass of the people, who read the Bible, read it because they are told it is their duty so to do. Having gone over the words, they think they have done their duty, without troubling themselves as to the sense. This is an evil, because they are apt to regard it as a work of propitiation, and the effect is much about the same as that produced by the Roman Catholic's bidding of his beads. *The Bible is a book for learned biographers and profound thinkers to read. It is undeniably a book of Mysteries, and is it, I ask any man who will speak sincerely possible for those who can barely read words, to derive any real profit from the perusal of such a book? No, it is from the exposition and application of the contents of the Bible, given by learned men, or by others who make use of those expositions and applications that people in general are to profit: these expositions and applications they will hear at church, and for my part, I cannot perceive how the capacity of reading would tend to make them either more attentive, or more docile."*

Cobbett's W. P. R. Sept. 26, 1807.

This is the cant of vulgar infidelity, of all cant the most loathsome. There is nothing disgraceful, nothing that requires concealment, (in our opinion, at least), in a man's withholding his assent from the Christian story; but we cannot see without disgust and abhorrence, a man professing to receive the Bible and yet avowing that he regards it as mysterious and incomprehensible, *except to that learning which he is known to hold in derision*, and denying that it is useful for the purpose, for which it professes to be chiefly given, the instructing and comforting of the poor, in other words, *the mass of mankind*, and denying this, for the sake of supporting the barbarising principle, that knowledge does not conduce to happiness. *Paine's* deism was manly; there was indeed a generosity in it; it was associated (falsely or not, it does not matter) with the idea of Liberty; it was the opposite less of christianity than of popery; it was a disavowal of the right of priests to hoodwink and tyra-

nize over mankind. The deism of tomes is pitiful and base. As if sensible of its ugliness, its face is always in a mask. Its approaches are insidious; its voice is hypocritical; it is the twin sister of superstition; a prostitute to priestcraft. It is the father of the vile brood of ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, delusion, and persecution. We have seen the monster in various shapes and places, with all its foul retinue at its heels. We have heard it hallooing and cheering dogs in their bloody onset on the noblest of animals, and men, as brutal as dogs, in their attempts to mangle and maim, and draw vital blood from, each other. We have heard it plead, as if life depended on it, for the eternity of negro-slavery, with its bell, its whips, and its tortures. We have heard it blaspheming the name of peace, and shouting with diabolical energy, WAR FOR EVER! meaning by that tremendous yell, not merely ill blood, and strife, hatred and contention, but robbery and murder, the conflagration of peaceful unsuspecting cities, and the massacre of unarmed men, women and children. And having seen and heard all this, ought we not to trace the steps of the fiend, and admonish the world to beware.

The passage given above from Cobbett is in his usual manner. It discovers a shrewd knowledge of human nature mixed with stupid prejudice; prejudices which the growing power of reason has, ere this, exploded even from the lowest ranks of the army. It is a good text. It does not require a man to be a parson to be able to preach from it.

The text says, 1. that the common people read the bible without understanding, and without studying it. True. Hence, such ignorance, such error among the vulgar; who conceive religion to be a mystery, and the Bible to be purely the Priests' book.

2. That they superstitiously imagine the reading of the Bible to be meritorious, a work of propitiation; in which respect the protestant poor are on the same degraded level with Roman Catholics. Another truth and a lamentable one! the evil wants to be remedied; how shall this be done? Take away their Bibles, or which is the same thing give them not the power of using them, says Cobbett; but let him not stop here. The common people make an equal merit of walking to church on a Sunday;

why, then, cut off their legs; and also, of eating the sacramental bread; well, proceed, and pluck out their teeth, or rather follow the custom of David's time and break their jawbone. This is strictly following up the no-reading plan, because reading has been abused, or rather regarded in a wrong light. Common sense is all the while forgotten, which says, if a man read the bible without study, "let him study;" if he read it without understanding it, "let him read it till he does understand it;" if he mistake the end of reading, "let him read on and he will grow wiser."

3. That the Bible, if universally read, would lead to "nothing short of UNIVERSAL SCHISM," which is now prevented only by ignorance, among the reader of the Bible, of its contents. A good hint to bishops and priests. Let them keep the people ignorant, or they may not be able to foresee, much less to control the consequences. But is this writer serious? does he really mean to affront the established religion of this country by representing that it is founded in ignorance, and ignorance, mind, of the Bible; and that as soon as men become Bible-taught they cease to be good churchmen? does he honestly intend the compliment to Methodists and Dissenters that they are such from reading the Bible, and that their being such, is the natural consequence of such reading? if so, let the church look to him; if not so, let him, when he next feels disposed to write about the Bible, look to himself. The sight of Latin is as abominable to him, as the sight of a poor man reading his Bible, else we might say, *ne autor*, &c. but in plain English "every man to his calling."

4. The Bible is undeniably a book of MYSTERIES. So said Thomas Paine, only with his usual honesty, he spoke out, and made use of a word more expressive than that of "mysteries," namely "riddles." But this is not "undeniable;" it may be denied; it is here denied. *Mysteries* the Bible talks about, but it reveals them, or makes them clear; they are secrets which the Bible tells. The Bible is a book of history, with inferences from that history called doctrines, or, commandments. A child may understand it; but the child must have eyes, and not be like some men, who pretend to see a long way, and who are at the same time,

wilfully, and it is to be feared, incurably blind. Mysteries, truly, an objection to the Bible! why, it denounces some *mysteries of iniquity*, and even them it explains. For instance, it foretels that *in the last days PERILOUS TIMES shall come*. The *Weekly Register* says, and seems to rejoice, that they are come. But the Bible shews what will bring on and constitute and aggravate, the *peril* of the *times*; and its description must be perpetually present to the mind of every constant reader of Cobbett's Political Journal; such an *agreement* is there between the Bible and him! *For men*, says this mystery-explaining book, *shall be BOASTERS, PROUD, WITHOUT NATURAL AFFECTION, TRUCE-BREAKERS, FALSE ACCUSERS, FIERCE, DESPISERS OF THOSE THAT ARE GOOD, TRAITORS, HEADY, HIGH-MINDED.*

5. "The Bible is a book for *learned historians and profound thinkers* to read. No doubt it is, for it knows no distinction of learning and the contrary, great talents and moderate ones. It puts all men on the same level. But thou ignorant, thou impudent contemner of the Scriptures, who would'st insinuate, that great learning and profound thinking are necessary to the right understanding of the Bible, to the right understanding of the Proverbs of Solomon, the Psalms of David, our blessed Lord's Sermon on the mount, his Prayer, or the parable of the Prodigal Son. This writer has no doubt confounded the common prayer book with the Bible, and been ruminating in his "profound" reveries upon the thirty-nine Articles and the forged creed called after Athanasius. *Learned historians*. If this be not, as we suspect, that sort of vulgar language concerning intellectual superiority which has no definite idea attached to it; if it be not sound without sense, it amounts to this, that before a man reads history, he must be a complete *historian*, using the word in the author's low-lived sense, of one versed in history and not in the ordinary and true sense of *historiographer*, a writer of history. *Profound thinkers* These only are to read Sir Isaac Newton's Principles, Kant's Transcendental, and the Bible. And the Bible must be thought of before it is known; first understood and then learned.

6. The perusal of such a book as the Bible, would not *profit* the poor: certainly not in the author's sense of profit. It

would not lead them to place their happiness, where he places it, in *merely animal pleasures*. It would not allow them to curse men, without knowing them, to extol them as soon as known, and then to curse them again when out of sight. It would not lead them to delight in brawling and quarrelling, cudgel-playing and bruising, cock-fighting, and bull-baiting. It would not domesticate them at the alehouse, and make them strangers at their own fire-sides. It would not carry them away from their work, over miles of country, to see the horrid spectacle (acted so often at Botley and the neighbourhood for the amusement and instruction, it is supposed, of the author's children) of men in health and vigour beating each other over the head with clubs, the blood spouting out, fragments of flesh flying in every direction, and out of a dozen persons all except one, the conqueror, having their heads actually broken! Thus the Bible would not *profit* the poor; it would not make them savages or brutes: and if these practices be manly, it would in effect *unman* them. It would make them meek and quiet, and tender-hearted. It would make them constant, kind husbands; affectionate, attentive, fathers. It would impel them to regular industry, and make the yoke of labour light. It would inspire them with contentment, by shewing that all things are wisely arranged by the fatherly hand of the Almighty, that nothing is in itself evil, and that in the end all pains and privations will be made up to the patient and virtuous. It would make every interval from labour valuable, by filling it up with pleasing and useful employment. It would consecrate the morning and sweeten the repose of night. It would lighten affliction, it would abolish the terrors of the grave. But what of this to the author of the P. R. if the man be a coward, if he dare not fight, or will not swear and curse! In the present times, the poor, who are the property of the country, are valuable only as they are ready to be turned into soldiers, and the whole of a soldier's business is, always and every where, to hate whomsoever he is told to hate, and to wound and tear and kill and slay, whomsoever he is told to destroy!

7. The Priest is the proper expounder of the Bible, and the Church is the on-

ly place where religion ought to be learned. Venerable principle! as old as popery! and happily admitted implicitly in Old England before Whiggism had debauched the public mind! For this, Cobbett, the clergy will pardon many, if not all, of thy late sins: this, with thy revilings of the republicans of the other world, with thy bawlings for the sovereignty of the seas, with thy cryings out for the demolition of Copenhagen, and thy loud protesting against Peace, at any time and under any minister; these things will go nigh to making thee a favourite with them; and wouldst thou cease thy eulogiums on Sir Francis, thy menaces about the Funds, and thy insinuations about a *change, a great change, a radical change*, thou mightest regain thy perihelion of glory, and be as in former days, the days of thy now-forgotten favourite, thy once-darling hero Pitt, be praised and handed from glass to glass, quoted and toasted at visitation dinners, and episcopal and archiepiscopal feasts! The PEOPLE, then, the unhappy people, are not to think, not to talk about religion. They must read the bible through churchmen's glasses. No matter what the knowledge, what the character of any one of the 10,000 parish priests in England and Wales, the sentence of every one of them is oracular, the word of every one of them is law; and the good people of this country are to believe precisely what they say, and to punctually obey all that they command. This is the doctrine of the champion of liberty, of the spokesman of the patriots of Westminster. It is fitting that such a writer should vilify Mr. Fox. It was natural that such a cherisher of the dying vermin of monks and friars should have detested and calumniated DR. PRIESTLEY. He is the right man for a *No Popery* ministry; a properly qualified agent to bring forward another Sacheverel, another Tory, Oxford Doctor, who shall make our pulpits resound with passive obedience and non-resistance. But, perhaps, after all, this is intended as irony; and along with hints about *Church Lands* may be designed to pave the way for a proposal to the political agitators of the day, to vote Priests useless, and Bishops a nuisance. Such a vote would not frighten us. Our only concern is to know how to under-

stand the drift of this writer; that we may not be taken unawares. His secret insinuations serve to explain, as they are doubtless explained by, his avowed doctrines. Some of the French *philosophers*, we remember, inculcated the most lavish ecclesiastical principles, till the opportunity arose of exploding all religious principles as dastardly superstitions!

8. And lastly, (for the text though not exhausted, is too disgusting to be dwelt on longer than is necessary.) A capacity of reading would not make the poor more attentive or docile at public worship. Not a *capacity* of reading it is true; but this writer *knows* that that is not what is contended for, but a *habit* of reading. A cudgel-player, a brawler, an ale house frequenter, may have the *capacity* of reading, aye, of reading the bible; but what avails it if he never improve it? Who ever talked of the beneficial effects of a mere capacity of working? while every one knows and asserts the benefits of *industry*. A capacity of reading is likely to beget the habit; and will any man be hardy enough to maintain, that he who is somewhat acquainted with written language, will not listen with greater attention, because with more understanding, to a public discourse, than one who has never contemplated the structure of a single sentence; or that he who has already learned a little, will not be a better scholar than he who has learned nothing? Why is a man, who is of a literary turn, more teachable and more ready to learn than a peasant, or a common soldier? Why, but because he knows more? For knowledge, which consists in the opening of the eyes, and of the ears, and of all the senses, naturally tends to open them still wider; and reading is the great source of knowledge.

This political Journalist is a curious instance of a person reading on purpose to find arguments for the inutility of reading; and truly, if reading led all men into his way of thinking, that statesman would deserve a statue to be erected to his memory, who should collect all the books that were ever written, and the paper that was ever manufactured, and all the printing-presses that were ever constructed, and make one joyful bonfire of them all. Around such a bonfire the familiars of the lu-

quisition, and the enemies of Mr. Whitbread's bill would clasp hands and dance, and sing the death-song of Knowledge. With the ashes of this funeral pile, the ingenious WINDHAM might form the image of IGNORANCE, and the zealous COBBETT would deserve to be anointed, with the juice that poisoned Socrates, *High-Priest* to the Goddess.

"— *Redeunt Saturnia regna:*

Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur ævo."

"Mere drinking, eating; eating, drinking;

With no impertinence of thinking "

G.

DAVID RICHARDS, a young man, who was a member of the General Baptist congregation under the care of the Rev. Benjamin Philips of St. Clear, has lately accepted an invitation from two Unitarian Baptist congregations, one in the town, the other in the neighbourhood of Cardigan, to settle with them as their stated minister. In consequence of this, there was a meeting of ministers held there on the 5th of November. The service was begun by Mr. Evan Evans, with reading and prayer; after which Mr. William Thomas preached from 2 Tim. iv. 5; Mr. James David from 2 Cor. xiv. 1. and Mr. Benjamin Philips from 1 Thess. v. 15, who also concluded the meeting. This is the first Unitarian Baptist minister who, as such, has been called to the pastoral charge of a congregation in the principality. We understand that Mr. Philips has another young man of promising abilities in his society, for whom he is desirous of procuring some advantages of education for the ministry in the Baptist connexion.

LETTER OF MR. PRESIDENT JEFFERSON'S ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.—America, by her example shames British intolerance. She is not only free, but she knows and prizes her freedom. Her present chief Magistrate, Mr. Jefferson, is a truly great statesman, and the Father of his country. His leading views in government coincide with those held by the late Charles

James Fox, than whom he is more fortunate, in this, that he is placed in a situation where he can carry his excellent principles into effect.

The Ministers and Messengers of the Baptist Churches of North Carolina having, at their late Association, presented a congratulatory address to Mr. Jefferson, the President returned the following answer:—

Washington, June 24, 1807.

"SIR—I have duly received the address signed by your self on behalf of the ministers and messengers of the several Baptist Churches of the North Carolina Chowan Association, held at Salem, and I proffer my thanks for the favourable sentiments which it expresses towards myself personally. The happiness which our country enjoys in the pursuits of peace and industry ought to endear that country to all its citizens, and to kindle their hearts with gratitude to the BEING under whose Providence these blessings are held. *We owe to him especially, thanks for the right we enjoy to worship him, every one in his own way, and that we have been singled out, to prove by experience, the innocence of freedom in religious opinions and exercises, the power of reason to maintain itself against error, and the comfort of living under laws which assure us that, in these things, 'there is none who shall make us afraid.'*

"I am peculiarly gratified by the confidence you express that no attempt will ever be made by me to violate the trust reposed in me by my fellow-citizens, or to endanger their happiness. In this confidence you shall never be disappointed. My heart never felt a wish unfriendly to the general good of my fellow-citizens.

"Be so kind as to present my thanks to the Churches of your association, and to assure them of my prayers for the continuance of every blessing to them now and hereafter; and accept yourself my salutations and assurances of great respect and consideration

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Mr. George Outlaw.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Complete List of Books on Theology and Morals, for Nov.

An Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament, with Reflections subjoined to each Section. By the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, with Memoirs of the Author. 3 vols. large 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Reflections on the War with Denmark. By Benjamin Flower. 6d.

Bartholomew Day Commemorated; a Discourse on the Use of Persecution in the Furtherance of the Gospel. Intended to have been preached August 24, 1807, at the Desire of the Committee for establishing a General Union of the Independent Churches. By S. Palmer. 8vo. 1s.

Thoughts on the Expediency of disclosing the Processes of Manufactures. By John Cennell, F. S. A. Edinb. and Perth. 8vo. 32 pp.

Lectures on the Truly Eminent English Poets. By Percival Stockdale. 2 vols. 8vo. with a Portrait of the Author. 1l. 1s.

The Danger of Reading Improper Books; a Sermon preached before the Independents, at their Monthly Meeting. By John Cayton, jun.

The Full Assurance of Hope, urged from the Words of the Apostle, Heb. vi. 2. By W. Howell, Knaresborough. 1s. 6d.

Animadversions on the "Admonitory Epistle to Rowland Hill." By J. Ball, Minister of Jewry-street Chapel, Aldgate. 1s.

Francis Quarles's Judgment and Mercy for Afflicted Souls. A new Edition, with a Head of the Author. With a Biographical and Critical Introduction. By R. Wolfe, Esq. cr. 8vo. 7s.

The Uncertainty of the Morrow: the Substance of a Sermon preached at Fulham Church. Sept. 13, 1807, on occasion of the late Fire in the premises of J. Ord, Esq. by which his gardener was burnt to death. By John Owen. M. A. 1s.

On Duelling: a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Strood, Gloucestershire, Aug. 23, on the much lamented death of Lieut. J. F. Delmont, who

fell a victim to it. By J. Williams. 1s.

An Attempt towards a statement of the Doctrine of Scripture on the Constitution, Government &c. of the Church of Christ. By G. Ewings, Glasgow. 2s. 6d.

Discourse, Moral and Religious, adapted to a Naval Audience. Preached on board His Majesty's Ship, the Tremendous, during the years 1802, 3, 4. By Robert Baynes, LL. B. 8vo. 12s.

Fourteen Sermons on various Subjects. By David Brichan, D. D. Minister of the Scotch Church, Artillery Street. 8vo. 8s.

A Looking Glass for Christians of every Denomination, and a Rod for Hypocrite of every Description. 2d.

An Address to Protestant Dissenters; recommending the Practice of Sitting while Singing the Praises of God in Public Worship. By a Layman. 6d.

Preparation for the Holy Order of Deacons, elucidated in a Charge delivered previously to an Ordination. By G. J. Huntingford, D. D. F. R. S. Bishop of Gloucester. 1s. 6d.

A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Chapel of Salisbury, in Lancashire. Sept. 8, 1807. Royal 4to. Notes. 3s. 6d.

The Nature and Importance of Preparatory Studies for the Christian Ministry, a Sermon, delivered at Loughborough, before the Governors of the General Baptists' Evangelical Academy. By D. Taylor. 1s.

The Chemical Catechism, with copious Notes, Vocabulary, Tables, and Experiments. By Samuel Parkes, Manufacturing Chemist. 8vo. 12s. Second Edition, with Additions.

Sermons on Various Subjects and Occasions. By the Rev. John Nance, M. A. 8vo. 6s.

LITERARY NOTICES.—*The Third Report* of the Committee of the UNITARIAN FUND, is in the press, and will be published in a few days. A copy will be sent to every Subscriber to the Fund, within the circuit of the Three-penny Post. Country Subscribers will be supplied with copies as opportunities of conveying them arise. The *Third*, and also the *Second Report*, may be had of the Booksellers.

MR. FRIEND'S *Evening Amusements* for the year 1808, come out this month.

They are formed upon a similar plan with the former volumes, and this volume makes the fifth of the series. The nature of the motions of the planets and comets in their orbits, forms the ground of various devices, to make astronomy familiar to the learner, and the plates give the positions of the stars in the progress of the comet. Its motion is traced in a familiar manner, and a question is proposed relative to it, which may occupy the attention of the most profound mathematician.

CORRESPONDENCE.

J. M.'s Replies to the *Clergyman* are postponed, with his consent, for insertion in our next volume, in which they will follow each other without interruption.

Our correspondent, the *Clergyman*, has favoured us with an Examination of the *Rev. F. Stone's* "Statement of his Case," in our last number, which, with the same impartiality, that has, we flatter ourselves, hitherto distinguished us, we shall insert in the next and concluding number of the present volume.

We are much pleased with the "Three Contemplative Walks," and the "New Pilgrim's Progress;" but their length necessarily renders them unsuitable to the *Monthly Repository*. The worthy author will not, we trust, consider this as a check to his sensible and pleasing pen. His communications are returned to the Printer.

A letter has been sent us under the signature of *Theophilus*, pointing out a supposed misrepresentation of Dr. Doddridge's Exposition on John iii. 13, and vi. 62, by Mr. Belsham, in his "Strictures on Mr. Carpenter's Lectures," in pp. 545 and 546 of our Magazine. Mr. Belsham asserts that the phrase "ascend up to heaven," in those passages is interpreted *figuratively* by Dr. Doddridge; this is denied by *Theophilus*, who makes several quotations from the Dr.'s Paraphrase and Notes, on the text in question, to shew that he believed in the pre-existence (or rather the divinity) of Christ, a point which Mr. Belsham, assuredly, never intended to deny: but *Theophilus* does not quote, and appears to have overlooked Dr. Doddridge's note on John iii. 13, which puts it out of all doubt that Mr. Belsham's interpretation of him is correct. *Theophilus* extracts also Dr. Clark's Paraphrase of these places, for the purpose of shewing (what is surely needless) that all expositors are not Unitarians. In spite however of his obvious error, and of his tedious diffuseness, we should have inserted his letter had it not been both ungrammatical and intemperate. He appeals to our impartiality, and upon this we certainly pride ourselves; but let it be remembered that while we disclaim all judgment upon the theological opinions of our correspondents, we profess to be rigorous judges of the literary composition and the temper of their papers. The *Monthly Repository* aspires to respectability, at the same time that it studies impartiality. *Theophilus* gives much good advice to Mr. Belsham, and points out to his notice some very profitable reading; not considering how truly ridiculous such a strain of writing is, even when well done, in an anonymous remarker upon a writer who has always given his name with his communications. If *Theophilus* be dissatisfied with the Editor's rejection of his letter, he may have it returned by applying at the Printer's: or, if he choose, it shall be there for the inspection of any of our readers, who may call our judgment in question.

The questions of the "Modest Querist," in our next. We thank him for the advice suggested by the question concerning the *Monthly* (not Theological) *Repository*, but this part of his paper, not belonging to the public, will not be published with the rest.

A correspondent inquires very anxiously "What has become of *Gogmagog*?" He that writes under a fictitious name, wishes, of course, to be concealed; and therefore we are not at liberty to divulge any thing concerning this, or any other contributor, who does not choose to appear before the public in his own person. In the main, *Amicus* is, we believe, right in his conjectures. We heartily wish his inquiry, thus publicly noticed, may have the effect of re-engaging in our service a writer, who has unquestionably the power and the merit of drawing attention.